

THE MINNS LECTURES
FOR 1958

Man, Myth and Maturity

by

FLOYD HIATT ROSS

THE MINNS LECTURESHIP COMMITTEE
64 Marlborough Street, Boston, Massachusetts

LIBRARY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BL
51
R59

IKB
R823m

✓
THE MINNS LECTURES
FOR 1958

Man, Myth and Maturity

by

FLOYD HIATT ROSS

Floyd Hiatt Ross

THE MINNS LECTURESHIP COMMITTEE

64 Marlborough Street, Boston, Massachusetts

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

FOREWORD

By the terms of her will Miss Susan Minns of Boston established a permanent fund "to be known as The Thomas Minns Fund in memory of my brother Thomas Minns, a descendant of John Wilson, the first minister of the First Church in Boston." She further directed that "nineteenths of the net income shall be used for the establishment of the Minns Lectureship to be under the direction and management of said First Church . . . and of King's Chapel. It is my wish that there shall be provided at least six lectures yearly upon religion or religious subjects, to be given by Unitarian ministers of good standing."

Since 1941 six lectures have been given each year. The lectures for 1958 are printed in this booklet for free distribution.

To

MY FELLOW-WAYFARER

PREFACE

These are purely exploratory lectures concerned with some of the implications of studies in depth psychology, symbolism and the comparative study of religious behavior and belief, and modern man's search for maturity or orientation.

I appreciate the opportunity which the Minns Lectureship Committee extended to me of lecturing on the Minns Foundation. Some of these ideas were first presented in much briefer compass at Pacific Oaks Friends School, Pasadena, and Pacific Ackworth Friends School, Temple City, California. The occasion at Atlanta, Georgia, was the first time they had been presented in written form. Being exploratory in nature, the lectures are designed to evoke further discussion and exploration.

May I express appreciation to the Rockefeller Foundation, Humanities Division, for a grant which enabled me to study Buddhist and Shinto religious traditions in Japan during the summer of 1958. Part of my concern was with the mythological dimension of Japanese religion.

Thanks go to Jeannette Griggs, Loy Domingos, and my wife, Frances J. Ross, for critical editing and secretarial assistance.

Jan., 1959

FLOYD HIATT ROSS

Blaisdell Institute for Advanced Study
in World Cultures and Religions
Claremont, California

Southern California School of Theology
Claremont, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	
I Modern Man and Myth	7
II Beyond Eden: Man and Guilt	22
III Man, Woman and Maturity	38
IV Toward Reconciliation	52

MAN, MYTH AND MATURITY

I

MODERN MAN AND MYTH

Introduction

The tremendous interest in the exploration of outer space through rockets, space ships, space platforms would suggest that twentieth-century man is on the verge of a great new frontier. Unfortunately the need to explore the inner world of man, that frontier where lights and shadows intermingle in a confusing way, does not seem to appeal to as wide a public. Yet it is much more imperative to know what operates in the depths of man than to see what is on the other side of the moon. Or as Eric Sevareid put it in one of his CBS broadcasts, it will be a tragedy for humanity if man advances on the bright side of the moon with the dark side of himself.

The first word in our title—*Man*—reminds us of how little we know about ourselves. The second word—*Myth*—is a reminder of the reassessment already going on with reference to man's capacity for symbolic transformation. *Maturity*, the third word, has come into prominence in our Occidental literature as a new term for mankind's effort to achieve his higher good or goal.

All three of the terms included in our title are subjects for discussion. This is all to the good. Until the fundamental questions have been formulated, there is little chance that modern man will find himself consciously on the way to his fulfilment. These lectures are an experiment in boundary-crossing by one who is not an expert in any of the fields. More questions will be raised than are answered. More generalizations will be attempted than can be presently validated. The old boundaries between the academic disciplines, where each scholar can quietly cultivate expertness, must be increasingly ignored if some of the newer hypotheses from the fields of depth psychology, studies of myth and symbolism, and work in comparative religion and personality disorders, are to be given a chance to inject new vitality into modern thought.

Modern Man's Problem

What is the problem of modern man?

His problem is that *he feels alien*.

Something of this mood has been caught in the lines of W. H. Auden.

We move on
As the wheel wills; one revolution
Registers all things, the rise and fall
In pay and prices . . .
. . . this stupid world where
Gadgets are gods and we go on talking,
Many about much, but remain alone,
Alive but alone, belonging—where?—
Unattached as tumbleweed.¹

When man is unattached at some central core point in his life, he attaches himself to all manner of goods, goals and gods. When man is lonely, he tries to lose himself in the crowd or in causes. What happens when the old gods and goals begin to falter? For one thing, the symptoms of anxiety increase in many individuals. For another thing, social problems seem to magnify out of proportion, defying efforts to resolve them by the usual methods.

Modern man does not have the self-knowledge he needs for meeting the challenges of life. He wants to live at peace with himself and his neighbors, but finds himself apparently threatened by his neighbors who have a different-colored skin, a different political complexion, a different flag. He strikes a posture of defiance himself, and in his clumsy efforts to make himself and his nation secure, he makes other nations equally insecure as they assume the same posture, a compound of fear and defiance. Modern secular man (Marxist or non-Marxist variety) claims to be rational, yet he lives by the unexamined assumptions, the irrational attitudes and rituals of his ancestors. He scorns the traditional myths of the dying and rising gods, of the Hero-Savior's journey to the underworld, of rebirth and resurrection, of the Kingdom of God, of the Messianic realm; while at the same time he gives a literally fantastic allegiance to leaders who seem to speak for God or History out of abysmal naïveté if not blindness. The shouting demagogue replaces the moralizing Puritan or priest and plays the role of the Heavenly Father to hordes of emotionally immature followers.

¹ W. H. Auden, *Age of Anxiety*, Random House, N. Y., 1947.

Modern man's sense of being alien is reflected in his increasing reliance upon psychiatrists and psychotherapists. This age which was to have seen the world made safe for democracy and liberty has become the "age of anxiety." Many a person is afraid of liberty, of freedom, so he searches for himself in things. This flight from himself has been called alienation. Simone De Beauvoir points out that whereas primitive people were alienated in *mana* and in the totem, civilized people are alienated in their souls, their egos, their names, their property and their work. Here is the primary temptation to inauthenticity, the failure to be genuinely oneself.¹

This, then, is the problem of increasing numbers of late-twentieth-century man: he feels alien, unattached, displaced.

Some Basic Assumptions About Man

Thinking cannot proceed without basic assumptions. An assumption basic to my own thinking must be frankly stated at the outset. Like all basic assumptions, it cannot be proved. *Emotional problems, or problems of maturity, are not merely medical*, though some problems of personality may require medical attention. Emotional problems are problems of the total personality, not just of the glands or cells. While they may be approached through the neurological and physiological bodily systems, they are due to distorted and distorting patterns of relatedness to the person's own self and to the world at large. One seeks relatedness as a total person to the degree that he is aware of himself as a total person. A person may fall into the trap of dissipating his energy in fragmentary relationships, one part here and another part there and so on. This is to lay the groundwork for personality splits and fruitless involvement in disintegrating experiences.

Having said this much, it is necessary to go further and indicate what seem to be basic human needs. In addition to the minimal needs for air, nutrition and the like, what are the more comprehensive needs of the human organism? There is a growing tendency today to regard man no longer after the fashion of the older dualisms—body versus flesh. Man is an organism which can be studied from the standpoint both of the *psyche* and of the *soma*. This organism has many needs. (Some students of human nature refer to them as "wants" or "wishes.") There is a need for rootedness, sometimes called a "sense of belonging." The infant, the child, the adult must have a basic security. When a person does not have a genuine core of inner security, he is likely to engage in an excess of rest-

¹ Simone De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, Knopf, N. Y., 1953, p. 47.

less activity and socializing in trying to find it. Many a fraternity, club or social organization serves as a makeshift for the closer, more intimate, relationships which would be actually satisfying.

Each person must have a sense of *self-worth*. Without it he is unable to withstand the stresses and strains of living. He must feel of importance to himself and he needs the support of feeling of worth to someone else. This need is undoubtedly related to the need for a sense of identity. When a person's sense of self-identity is undeveloped, he tends to over-identify with the herd, the group, the tribe.

Perhaps the most profound need of all is the need to grow, to mature or to move toward maturity. At the physiological level, maturity means the optimum development, in a series of stages, of the organism's latent potentialities. In an analagous sense we must speak of psychological and spiritual maturity. To be alive is to act. Through action our potentialities unfold and develop. This means there must be openness to the world of experience. One's capacity for sustained wonder must not be allowed to atrophy. There must also be some open channel of significant two-way communication with another person or persons.

The need to grow is closely associated with the need to be creating. As we act creatively, we become increasingly aware of our creative potentialities. Where creation is, joy is. Or, in the words of Jane Harrison, "Wherever joy is, creation has been. . . . True joy is not the lure of life, but the consciousness of the triumph of creation."¹

Where we are now open to experience and the quality of our communication to another person or persons is rich, one discovers the releasing of the springs of creativity in himself. Where this quality of relationship indispensable to genuine creativity and growth is lacking, the person tends toward bitterness and destructiveness under many guises. One outcome of "unlived life" is destructiveness. "Unlived life" results in atrophy of our potentialities and often leaves a person with unguessed reservoirs of pent-up energy which may escape with explosive and destructive fury.

Since man is potentially a rational being, there is need for a frame of reference wherein one spells out at each stage of his pilgrimage some of the meanings he has provisionally appropriated. There are intellectuals in our society who try to live too much by logic, by concepts, by reason alone, tending to be afraid of the unconscious, the spontaneous, the instinctive. Man needs to live the life of reason with proper perspective, using logic, rationality, concepts as instruments but not letting the think-

¹ Jane Harrison, *Ancient Art and Ritual*, Williams & Norgate, London, 1913, p. 213.

ing process become the goal of his life. Thought is a necessary part of the life of a highly-developed man, but it can give us neither basic assumptions nor goals. It is part of our life, never the whole.

So much for some of the deeper needs of human nature. Human beings in different cultures have satisfied these needs in various ways, but the needs are not shaped by the cultures in their deepest roots. Mark Twain, after his innocent trip abroad, commented sagely when he summarized his impressions, "Human nature is very prevalent." There are structures basic to the human organism, as human, which we must seek to understand. Perhaps our progress toward richer maturity is dependent upon our increasing understanding of these structures.

Myth and Depth Psychology

To discover what these psychic structures are, modern students of human nature are taking up the appreciative study of dreams, myths and ancient symbols. The work of Freud, Adler and Jung represent modern pioneering efforts to explore the depths of man's inner life. These two lines of approach have tended to converge, so that the new interest in depth psychology demands a parallel interest in myth and symbol.¹

Myths are no longer being regarded primarily as pre-scientific efforts on the part of primitive man to explain the origin of the world "out there," nor are they studied simply as literature. Along with dreams they are now recognized as supplying significant data for extending our understanding of the psychic life in general.²

Myth was early man's way of knowing this world. They are products of the child-mind of the human race. Myth, ritual and language all arise spontaneously out of the tension which the child-man senses between his inner world and the world "out there." Then as now, the force of *impression* from without is confronted with an active force of *expression*, in Whitehead's language. Part of the spontaneous expression took the form

¹ For a good many years, both Protestant and Jewish religious leaders have been becoming better acquainted with the methods and findings of psychiatry and psychotherapy generally. The Roman Catholic Church has moved with more hesitation, but many individuals within it have gone on record in favor of exploring these new disciplines. See the article, "St. John of the Cross and Modern Psychology," by a Carmelite priest, Bruno De Jesus-Marie, in *Cross Currents*, Vol. VII, No. 2, Spring, 1957. He writes, "... It is our opinion that it will be the honest and well-qualified psychoanalyst (there are other kinds), in his attempt to explore the profundities of depth psychology, rather than the metaphysician or still less the theologian, who will open the door to the mystery of man" (p. 156).

² Romano Guardini, "Myth and the Truth of Revelation," *Cross Currents*, No. 2, Winter, 1951, writes as a Roman Catholic.

Theodore Reik, *Myth and Guilt*, Braziller, N. Y., 1951, writes as a Freudian. Both agree on the importance of studying myth.

of words and myths. "Word magic" and "name magic" were very real to early man, just as they are to primitive-minded moderns. In addition, through such "word magic" the struggling ego was laying hold of a vaguely-apprehended external world and was learning how to control its inner excitations.¹

Through his tribal rituals, early man sought to avail himself of the powers which he sensed in and around himself; or he tried to protect himself against the hostile power. Myth in the form of narrative arose as a by-product of these rituals. Myth represented his efforts to interpret the ritual to himself and to his children. For the modern empirical investigator or scientist, theory or hypothesis plays essentially the same role as myth.

If we examine myths from all of the known primitive cultures, we discover that there are common elements in myths which recur again and again. These seem to be universal, rooted in the structure of experience or in the human psyche itself. These universal symbolic elements found in myths are often referred to as the "archetypal images."

Myth then is a kind of universal human language, pre-critical in that it is heavily freighted with emotional overtones and undertones. Recurring mythic themes are those of the original wholeness or the Primal Unity; the Primal Sacrifice "in the beginning"; the Conflict between Light and Darkness; the Hero's Journey; the Descent into the Depths; and so on. Human life in the past thousands of years seems to have unfolded itself, and been interpreted recurrently, in terms of these themes.

We shall seek to interpret some of these themes, even though the interpretation of myth is a perilous task. Not all the myths that have been preserved, either in the oral or written tradition, are equally valuable for an understanding of man's psychological evolution. Extraneous localisms sometimes make it hard to discover the central mythic theme. With the passage of time myths are transformed, and then reinterpreted. At first acted out primitively, even savagely as when human victims are literally killed in the rituals, they gradually become more humane; an animal may be substituted for the human victim, but the underlying motif seems to remain.

The profounder myths resist intellectualization, for they arise out of the unconscious and appeal directly to intuition and imagination, thus

¹ See Ernst Cassirer, *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, Vol. 2; Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*, Norton, N. Y., 1945, p. 46.

stirring the unconscious.¹ With developing esthetic perceptiveness, the myth tends to become increasingly a matter of the inner life; its outward expression in the ritual becomes more artistic, it may be. When philosophers intellectualize the myth, or incorporate it into dogma (as in the Christian tradition), much of the appeal of the basic myth is lost. Its "authority" is lessened though the unconscious goes on remembering. Mythical patterns do still operate in modern secular man, as dream-analysis reveals. We might say that dreams are often fragmentary traces of a deep racial memory. In a sense the great mythic themes are the dreams of humanity.

All myths make use of symbols. The constantly recurring symbols—the snake with its tail in its mouth, the circle, the cross, the breast, the vessel, the mother goddess figure, to name just a few—seem to have mythic roots in the unconscious level of man's experience. It is the nature of a symbol to "point beyond itself"; that is, it *means* more than it says. It is a kind of reminder of some larger or richer experience. Thus symbols must be distinguished from signs. As a rule, signs have much more specific denotations. A street sign is a good example here. Many signs help us to answer the question, "How do things work?" Symbols usually invite us into an area of exploration where it is much harder to be precise than in the area of signs. A primary function of a symbol is to *re-mind* us; that is, to put a new mind in us.

We have asserted that myths arise out of the structure of man's make-up, and that they speak a symbolic language. What function do they serve?

They are intimately related to the human quest for *meaningful integration*. It is through myth and symbol that man has learned to find meaning in his experiences. An empathetic study of myth should tell us something about modern man's search for orientation. A psychotherapist is concerned with the dreams of his patient and with his daily rituals. In

¹ The word "unconscious" is subject to great misunderstanding. Progoff says that Jung's basic concept is that "the psychic area which he designates as the 'unconscious' is the source out of which all the materials of consciousness as a whole emerge. In this sense, the unconscious is a positive rather than a negative factor. It is amorphous to the degree that it is difficult to analyze by intellectual tools, but it is conceived as a definite entity with a creative role in the psyche: it supplies the fundamental symbols and other psychic contents that are brought to the surface in daily life." Ira Progoff, *Jung's Psy. and Its Social Meaning*, Grove Press, N. Y., 1953, p. 54.

Erich Fromm says, "The 'unconscious' is the unconscious only in relation to the 'normal' state of activity. . . . The term 'unconscious' is customarily used solely from the standpoint of day experience; and thus it fails to denote that both conscious and unconscious are only different states of mind referring to different states of existence." *The Forgotten Language*, Rinehart, N. Y., 1951, p. 29.

the same spirit the historian of religion should be concerned with the dreams of humanity, and with the accompanying rituals. Though some persons may claim to reject all the traditional mythologies of mankind in the name of a scientific view of experience, such people unwittingly testify to the power of the drive for unity—one of the central mythic themes. Even the positivist dreams of a unifying hypothesis.

Man the Measure

Before turning to a specific mythic theme, it is necessary to say something about the relativity of all interpretations of experience. Early man, like every young child, perceived the world under the form permitted by the pre-conscious structural pattern of the human nervous system. Within the limits permitted or demanded by these psycho-biological structures, he formed images which he projected upon the world around himself. Every object we see "out there" is actually formed in the mind as a result of the stimulus of light striking the retina of the eye. We assume that the image corresponds to the object "out there." In other words, we continually "project" mental images on the outer world. Sometimes these images are quite accurate representations, but often they are distorted by our inaccurate observation or by our hopes and fears.

It is helpful if a distinction is made between the "raw material" world or the world of primary sense data, and the "desire and fear" world. The world we *live* in is the throbbing world of fears, anxieties, loves, hates, dreams, aspirations. This is a world we construct.¹ The world we describe scientifically, by dividing up into pieces and then reassembling in terms of hypotheses, is a cold abstraction lifted out of the context of our lived-through experiences. It may be as precise as the photograph of a living person, but it is just as lifeless; the photograph is no substitute for the living person.

To use an analogy, man might be compared to the movie projector which throws images on a screen. But man is a vibrant projector, throwing images both while asleep and awake. Each person is a projector, a producer of the script within certain limits, and an actor. The screen is man's total environment, both inner and outer, and it overlaps with the screens of other persons who are engaged in the same processes.

We "construct" and "project" this value-laden world of ours out of our hopes and fears, out of our attractions and repulsions, out of our conscious experiences and our unconscious potentialities. We project out of our desire for order and system, and we project out of our muddled unorganized tendencies.

¹ In what sense this is true of the raw material world we leave to the epistemologist and the researchers in perception.

The verbal distinction which we commonly make between inner and outer can be very misleading. For the very immature person, as for the infant and the primitive, there is no fixed perception of a distinction. The world of dreams, of spirits, of ferocious animals, of demons is often just as real as the waking world. Early man lives so immediately in his sensations that he finds it hard to pull a "self" out of them or apart from them. A similar lack of orientation in the very young child produces the same mixing of inner and outer. "Causes" are assigned on a purely emotional basis. If primitive man stumbled over a tree root, he assumed that the tree, or the spirit in the tree, "had it in for him." The same holds true for the immature person today, child or adult. He "over-personalizes" his world, like the person in the front row of the psychology class who, when the professor suggested that many people tend to take everything too personally, replied warmly, "I don't!"¹ The world we live in is thus a trying world, a mixture of ourselves and of an "X," the Actual World. At times it seems to be impossible to know whether one is making significant progress in bringing the two worlds close to convergence. One can appreciate the bitterness of the six-year-old who, after a difficult day with his mother and father, complained, "I had no idea when I was born it was going to be so hard." Pessimists have been heard to say that all of life is a process of disillusionment. The teacher might rephrase it and say that much of learning is a process of letting go our illusions.

How do we find out more about the real world? By starting with the world we live in. There is no other way. Without praise and without blame, we must creep up on ourselves in a friendly spirit, try to look at our projections as a skilled psychiatrist reads a Rorschach. By looking at our projections, perhaps we can learn something about the nature of man the projector.²

¹ This process of projecting upon others what we cannot wrestle with comfortably has become highly dangerous in these days of technological efficiency in weapons of destruction. Lewis Mumford points out, "Since all preparations for mass extermination must be secret, we really tend to project upon our enemies our own plans for aggression. On an alarming scale, this transformation has already taken place. Our fear of Russia is proportionate to the damage we believe ourselves capable of inflicting on Russia, and the very secrecy that our own weapons impose only weakens the possibilities of rational control" (*In the Name of Sanity*, Harcourt, Brace, N. Y., 1954, p. 89).

² Man has projected into three regions, the heavens above himself, the earth, and the realm which he experiences vaguely as a dark space "under" himself or "within" and which takes the pictorial form of the underworld, the Shades, Sheol, or the Japanese Yomi. These all, in part if not entirely, are the pictorial expressions of his own unconscious. All these regions have been peopled with images of his unconscious, most of which arose spontaneously, without conscious thought. As man came to some self-awareness, he "interpreted" these mythic ejects, producing literary myths or narratives. His rituals he rarely sought to interpret. In the ritual he *became* the projected being.

The Primal Myth

The primal myth is a myth of origin, of a remembered wholeness, of a subsequent fragmentation or trauma of creation, and of a desire to realize the wholeness once more. It is a myth of "in the beginning" but the beginning referred to is not so much chronological time as it is psychological time. Its theme is of creation but it contains the dream of re-creation. The form which the earliest creation myths of mankind have taken in ancient India, China, the Near East and elsewhere, reflect the sophisticated interpretations of adults; but the symbolism imbedded in them is that of our infancy, our own individual infancy as well as our racial infancy.¹

"In the beginning" has nothing to do with history in the ordinary, or linear, sense of the term. It is the recurrent beginning, recapitulated in the life story of every man born. The earliest visual symbol of the beginning is of a circle, the "round," often taking the form of the snake with its tail in its mouth.

This is the earliest symbol of perfection and also a reminder of the embryonic period when digestion, assimilation and elimination were completely self-contained. In Hindu terminology the "round" is also described as *Hiranyagarbha*, meaning Golden Egg or Cosmic Womb (*garbha*). The innermost shrine in a Hindu temple is the Womb, the Center, both the source and the goal. At the more abstract philosophical level of interpretation the "round" becomes the Unmoved Mover and the Unbegotten Godhead. For Plato it is the symbol of perfection, as in the *Timaeus*. For the mystic it is the circle whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere. The circle is often thought of as enclosing the maternal waters, the waters of the "deep" ("Tehom," in the Hebrew tradition). The symbolism of the cosmic maternal waters is probably older than the circle. Water and womb very naturally assimilated each other in the symbolism of the unconscious. Water, womb, circle, round are all symbols of the primal state of perfection, the "Mother of the Universe."²

¹ For an indication of the written sources to which I am especially indebted, see the bibliography at the end.

² Cf. Tao Teh Ching 25.

"There is a thing inherent and natural,
Which existed before heaven and earth.
Motionless and fathomless,
It stands alone and never changes;
It pervades everywhere and never becomes exhausted.
It may be regarded as the Mother of the Universe."

Translation of Ch'u Ta-Kao, in R. Ballou, *Bible of the World*, Viking, New York, 1939.

As myth, fairy tale and poets have made clear, the perfect circle also stands for Paradise, a Garden of Eden, a Golden Age vaguely "remembered" in the unconscious and projected outwardly in theories of the good old days." All the peoples of mankind who have left any records at all imply some faith in the existence, or pre-existence, of such a perfect place or condition.¹

There is no evidence from any source that there ever was an actual Golden Age in the past, or a perfect Garden of Eden. But Hindus, Taoists, Confucianists, Hebrews, Christians and Moslems have all agreed in talking as though there were one. Even though the myth has no historical basis in the "outer" sense, it must have a basis in human experience in some sense. One can speculate that this paradisaical state has been "projected" there by the human organism on the basis of its pre-natal experience and the few months following upon actual birth. For several months after birth the infant can be said to have no separate ego. This pre-ego stage has been called the "original we" stage of consciousness. The infant is like a tadpole swimming in the "round," wholly contained in the "original we." The infant sleeps most of the time. Its eyes cannot focus. Only occasionally does there seem to be a hint of an ego-consciousness or a coming to terms with the big, booming, buzzing confusion around it. All of its needs are satisfied by the "Great Nourisher," with no real effort on its own part aside from that of sucking.

In the terms of the biblical myth of the Garden of Eden, is this not the Garden before any serpent—any opposite or "other"—has appeared? One lives in a well-designed park that demands no labor. The food dangles from the trees. One lives protected in a perfectly walled-in situation. Circle, paradise, womb, walled-in place—probably all stand for the same human memory: security.

Man everywhere seems to have lived his life haunted by this dream of a primal perfection, of a state of perfect at-one-ment with the "Mother of All." This is hinted at over and over in the writers both of prose and of poetry.

Flesh, I have knocked at many a dusty door,
Gone down full many a windy midnight lane,
Probed in old walls and felt along the floor,
Pressed in blind hope the lighted window-pane.

¹ The Greek word *paradeisos* means, garden, pleasure-grove, park. It is probably Persian in origin, from the old Persian, *pairi daeza*, to pile up or around; i. e. a place walled in. According to the opinion of many of the early church fathers, the paradise in which the first human parents lived before the Fall, still exists, neither in earth nor in the heavens, but above and beyond the world. Cf. J. H. Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon*, American Book Company, New York, 1889.

But useless all, though sometimes, when the moon
 Was full in heaven and the sea was full,
 Along my body's alleys came a tune
 Played in the tavern by the Beautiful.

Then for an instant I have felt at point
 To find and seize her, whosoe'er she be.
 Whether some saint whose glory doth annoint
 Those whom she loves, or but a part of me,
 Or something that the things not understood
 Make for their uses out of flesh and blood.¹

All myths of the original perfect state go on to describe trouble in paradise. Does this not reflect a universal experience? Every infant makes the discovery, sooner or later, that it is *not* the total universe, and that it cannot go on being simply a placid receiver or inordinate consumer. This may happen at weaning, or when another child is born, or through the convergence of other factors. Whatever happens, when it happens, the infant finds itself apart from the world. The infant is shoved away from the Great Nourisher. He is expelled from the Garden. This is a major shock which every infant goes through, and it must contribute to the sense of being alien.² The myths, as they came to be cast into narrative form, suggest that this event is experienced as a kind of betrayal on the part of the mother. How the child accepts this betrayal will condition to a great extent the path of his future growth. Two extreme attitudes are possible to the child-man. Either he feels "I am always wrong," or "They are always wrong." The Good World has become the Terrible World. The Nourisher has become the Rejecter.³ Pain must now be accepted as a

¹ John Masefield, "Sonnet," *A Little Treasury of Modern Poetry*, Oscar Williams, ed., Scribner's, N. Y., 1946.

² Simone De Beauvoir states that the infant "immediately after weaning, when he is separated from the Whole, . . . is compelled to lay hold upon his alienated existence in mirrors and in the gaze of his parents" (*The Second Sex*, p. 47). Maryse Choisy claims this shock is experienced by the infant as an "infidelity" on the part of the mother. Cf. "Psychoanalysis and Catholicism," *Cross Currents*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1951, p. 81.

³ The myth has implications for the personal mother also. Choisy adds, "The pivot of the family structure is the mother. It is the mother who determines the degree of ambivalence in the baby, and the future conflicts of the man." For it is on the mother that the child makes his first projections. "The mother is the first being that he loves and hates at once. He loves her when she caresses him and gives him her milk. He hates her when she withdraws from him and frustrates his desire. A nursing infant is total in his reactions. The drama of man is that the first object of his love is also the first object of his aggression. It is an irreducible starting-point." The infant wants the mother for himself. The duel of Cain and Abel is "inscribed in the personal proto-history of each" (Maryse Choisy, *op.cit.*, p. 81).

teacher, not just Pleasure. It is at this point that the infant experiences fear of some great Unknown.

In the case of the Genesis myth of the Garden of Eden, edited from the distinctly patriarchal point of view and thus slanted, the accusation of "betrayal" is laid against woman. It is the woman who persuades the man to eat. It is through the woman Adam is tempted to fall. Is this the child-man's way of saying, "Woman betrayed me"? As workers with young children know, when a young child loses a parent by death or separation, the child seems to hold this against the parent. There is a correlated phenomenon: the child assumes that in some sense he is responsible for the parent's "desertion." One five-year-old, when told that his mother had died in the hospital, said, "If I had been a good boy, mamma wouldn't have died, would she?"¹ The child senses his own nakedness before the world. Like Adam, he tries to hide among the trees in the Garden. He is torn within; the frustrated nursing child wants to bite the Nourisher but he has learned to be afraid of reprisals. He may become angry, aggressive, or self-accusing. Love and hate now exist side by side. Alongside of his rudimentary guilt feelings is his accusation against the World.

In the patriarchal versions of the creation myths the woman is always made subject to the man. This quite possibly reflects the developing ego-strength of the males. For Jung it also indicates the subordination of the unconscious life to consciousness; reason, logic, law, legalism will rule from now on! In the Semitic tradition, the ground is also cursed. Man feels alienated from Mother Earth. Consciousness is condemned to working out its salvation through sweat and toil, burdened with a sense of "original guilt" or sinfulness. The unconscious is no longer friendly as it was.

In the Genesis version of the myth, severe though the punishments are, there is still an element of graciousness displayed on the part of God. "The Lord God made skin tunics for the man and his wife, and clothed them" (Gen. 3: 21). This replaced the fig-leaf garments which Adam and Eve had made for themselves to cover their nakedness. As the early church father, Irenaeus, pointed out, fig leaves must have been very scratchy garments. The Lord must have felt Adam and Eve were overdoing their self-punishment. A modern Irenaeus might have gone on to suggest that similarly in the life of every child, though it is weaned and thus "shoved away" from the mother, the growing child can still return to the mother's lap from time to time, to explore a different type of relationship, a growing one that involves the facing of other developmental tasks.

¹ On the complex problem of guilt, see lecture two.

Great as are the individual diversities of the myths of a primal perfect state, they all agree that man was expelled and that something like an angel with a flaming sword guards the entrance back to the garden, to the tree of life. Yet all imply a yearning to return and the basic rituals of mankind are dedicated to that end. How does one go *back* or *on* to wholeness?

X In this myth of a perfect state which is lost, the fundamental problem of humanity seems to be stated. To grow beyond the stage of the embryo means to accept a world of differences, of shocks, of pain as well as pleasure. Somewhere along the line the world of *differences* becomes the world of *opposites*. Can the individual accept this polarity without becoming completely schizoid or interpreting the world in dualistic terms—Satan versus God, the bad pitted against the good, flesh versus spirit? Can one seek the reconciliation of the opposites on the experiential plane? Shall he follow the vision or simply adjust to the immediate world?

Everyman seems to be subject to two pulls. One is the pull of inertia, the desire to return to old securities, a kind of psychological law of entropy or down-grading of energy. The other pull is more subtle, and apparently weaker in most of us: the desire for a unitive vision and unitive experience that will include the "lost" elements of the past with the added overtones of maturity and awareness.

Twentieth-century man runs the peril of being overwhelmed by the inertia of tradition. G. R. Taylor writes:

"We seem unable to escape from the tyranny of our obsessive demands, to serve which we have created a mode of life wherein the direct satisfaction of instinctual needs has become increasingly difficult. Like a river flowing through an alluvial plain, we continue to follow the course which, aeons ago, the water once carved out. . . . The river does not change: it only becomes more and more characteristically itself. In the same way, we in the West seem incapable of finding new modes for the expression of our fundamental needs to love and hate, to build and destroy; we can only express them in a manner which is ever more characteristic of what we have always done. We are ruled by the dead."¹

X This pessimistic conclusion of Taylor's is not the only possible conclusion. There is a better way than that of being drowned by the inertia of tradition. Two things seem to be necessary, however. The first of these is a core of reality within dead realities, a known area of awareness to

¹ *Sex in History*, Vanguard, N. Y. 1954, p. 306.

which one "belongs." In addition there should be a *direction of seeking* that brings one closer to the edges of awareness. Here the road is not charted. Here takes place that searching for that "which one knows to be one's own, and which one also recognizes as having been lost." The search for this takes one beyond the known area of awareness. It involves the spirit of eternal beginnings. In Christopher Fry's *The Dark Is Light Enough*, Countess Rosmarin says as she faces death, "Please God, to the last moment I will begin."¹

Harding

In the lines from another of Fry's writings—

"Dark and cold we may be, but this
Is no winter now. The frozen misery
Of centuries breaks, cracks, begins to move;
The thunder is the thunder of the floes,
The thaw, the flood, the upstart Spring.
Our time is now. . . ."²

¹ Oxford, London, 1954.

² Christopher Fry, *A Sleep of Prisoners*, Oxford U. Press, N. Y., 1951.

II

BEYOND EDEN: MAN AND GUILT

"But the hardest frost of a year
Will not arrest the growing world
As blame and the memory of wrong will do."

—Christopher Fry, *The Dark Is Light Enough*

Mankind is haunted by the dream of a primal perfection. The first episode in man's journey into life is that of gratification. The second episode, following soon thereafter, is that of deprivation. After the expulsion from the Garden comes the life of toil, tribulation, taboo and grief.

When Adam and Eve awoke in the thin light
After the first night in their desert bed,
For one heart-beat it must have seemed
That they had dreamed
A blurred nightmare of sin and sudden loss,
Of that swift-turning sword,
The unpitying angels and the hard
Irrevocable closing of a gate.

They would look back towards Eden, across
The flat unprofitable land
With its barbed plants, glisten of mica, flinty stone,
Its salt wells, and the lion-tracks in the sand,
And seen afar
The Garden shining like a tiny star
Green, green in its own luminous air,
Remote as a mirage and O, how fair!
It must have been then humanity's despair
Awoke: their hearts broke
And the first tears sprung,
And to man's astonished tongue
Came, bitter beyond belief,
The incredible taste of grief.¹

How the person comes to terms with "the incredible taste of grief" and the sense that a curse has been laid upon his world will condition the pattern of his future pilgrimage.

¹ Leah Bodine Drake, *This Tilting Dust*, p. 37.

Some of the poets see all of creation groaning under the burden of this great melancholy.

And yet within the warm and watchful beast
is weight and care of some great melancholy.

For, to the beast as well, there always clings
what often overwhelms us—memory,
as though the goal to which we strive had once
been nearer and more trustful, and its contact
immeasurably nearer.

All is distance here;
there it was breath. Compared with that first home
the second seems a hybrid thing and windy.

O rapture of the little creature which
stays ever in the womb that brought it forth!
Joy of the gnat that on its wedding day
is womb-enslaved still—for womb is all.¹

Anthropologists interested in primitive religion have commented on so-called "primitive monotheism," or in the belief in a one God lying behind the polytheistic beliefs and practices of such groups. This belief, wherever found, has been only latent, dimly held, not an active part of the tribal ritual. The psychological explanation of the belief probably lies in the infant's experience of the loving face of the Great Nourisher who gave her breast at the slightest whimper. After the breast is withdrawn, that is, after the expulsion from the Garden, the child's world is filled with differences which tend to become opposites under the impact of adult verbalizations. Hence the emergence of polytheism or the belief in many powers, some good and others not so good, and some even evil. In a sense these powers are the fragments of the One Deity, or the initial experience of Wholeness.²

The Primal Sacrifice

The shattering of the wholeness of the infant's world is reflected in the creation myths whose central theme is the Primal Sacrifice, of the separation of the World Parents.

In the Maori creation myth, in the beginning was darkness, for Father Heaven and Mother Earth had not yet been rent apart. The chil-

¹ Rainer Maria Rilke, "Eighth Elegy," *Duino Elegies*, Norton, N. Y., 1939.

² Cf. E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, 8 Vols., 1953, Pantheon, N. Y., Vol. 4, p. 51.

dren whom they had begotten were not aware of what the difference between light and dark might be. Oppressed by the darkness, most of the offspring decided to slay their parents. One spoke up and said, "It is better to rend them apart and let one stand above us and the other lie beneath our feet. Let Rangi (the masculine principle) become a stranger to us, but the earth remain close to us as a nursing mother." After various ones of the children had tried to rend the two apart without success, Tane-mahuta planted his feet on the head of the mother and tore Rangi away from her in spite of their strong protests, "and darkness was made manifest, and light was made manifest also."¹

This mythic theme is repeated almost everywhere. A hero, or herogod, elevates the sky above the earth. In ancient Egypt, Nut is lifted above Geb by Shu. From Chaldea comes the story of Bel cutting in two the non-natural woman, Omorca, converting the halves of her body into heaven and earth. On the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel in Rome, Michelangelo painted God in the act of dividing light from darkness, a reflection of the Semitic version of the same theme except the hero has been replaced by God himself.

Central to the stories is the idea that creation involves mutilation, dismemberment, or slaying. "The lamb slain from the foundation of the world" is the Christian reiteration of the motif. According to the Jewish Cabala, the first man, Adam Kadmon, made a division between the King and Queen. He sundered the Shekinah from union with her spouse. In the Babylonian creation myth the hero, Marduk, cuts up the great female serpent, Tiamat, and builds the world from her pieces. We shall look at the Hindu account in more detail.

The Hindu Myth

"In the beginning," the timeless beginning which is recapitulated in the life of every person, was the supreme identity of That One.

Non-existence then was not, nor Existence,
Neither Firmament, not Empyrean there beyond:
What covered o'er all, and where, or what was any resting place?
What were the Waters? Fathomless abyss.

¹ See the lengthy account in Neumann, *Origins and History of Consciousness*, Pantheon, N. Y., 1954, pp. 102-3. Cf. J. G. Frazer, *The Worship of Nature*.

Then was neither death nor life, nor any fetch of night or day.
That One breathed breathless by intrinsic power,
None other was, nor aught there-beyond.
In the beginning, Darkness there was, hidden by darkness,
This all was fluid, indeterminate. . . .¹

"That One" is called by many names in the Hindu myths. In one version it is Purusha, Cosmic Man. Purusha is the sacrifice prepared by the gods, his own offspring. He is dismembered and the whole of creation comes from his severed portions.²

Another version describes the primal sacrifice in terms of the manly deed of Indra who slays the Dragon lying on the mountain, disclosing the waters and cleaving the channels of the mountain torrents. Vritra, the Dragon, lies with scattered limbs dismembered. "Then humbled was the strength of Vritra's mother: Indra hath cast his deadly bolt against her."³

This theme, with its many interesting hints of both matriarchal and patriarchal versions in its subsequent history, is the basic Passion Story of mankind. Without cleavage or mutilation, no world can come into being. The nameless, unknowable First Principle, can be called Purusha (Person), Mountain, Dragon, Tree, Ananta (Endless Serpent), or the Cosmic Adam. The names make no difference. The slaying is "real," a poetic expression of Everyman's birth which is also a mutilation. The Dragon and the Dragon Slayer are in reality one; that is, it is the same life force, or cosmic libido, expressing itself in terms of the opposites of finite life. Without death, there is no birth; without birth, there is no death. In the more advanced terms of the Indian myth after it had undergone considerable refinement, the Dragon Slayer stands for the real Self; the Dragon stands for the little self, or the ego. For the ego seeks to be "all in all"; for the real Self to be born, the ego must be shattered, dismembered.

In this recurring myth of the Dragon, or the Lamb, "slain from the foundation of the world," is the fundamental problem posed from the depths of the unconscious for Everyman in every generation. Man senses an inner fragmentation. He feels at war with himself, or beside himself. It is the perennial story of the Prodigal Son who squanders the patrimony given to him, who tries to live on the husks of an unintegrated way of life, and who yearns to "return to the Father." If the story of mankind has

¹ Rig Veda X, 129. The translation follows Coomaraswamy and Barnett.

² Rig Veda X, 90.

³ Rig Veda I, 32.

commonly been told in the theistic language of traditional religion, this does not imply that the story is the possession of the traditional religions and their rituals. For the same pilgrimage is being traced through the offices of the psychoanalysts, and the same rituals, differently expressed outwardly, are being performed day after day in skyscraper offices. Wherever a person seeks strength, wisdom or just a soporific for going on, the Primal Theme is being enacted.

Even the ritual of compulsive smoking provides partial physiotherapy. There is some release from inner tension. When the compulsive smoker begins to inquire into the roots of his compulsion, he is moving in the direction of psychotherapy. That is, what is sought is self-understanding. In the language of philosophic Hinduism, he is seeking *atma-jnana*, Self-awareness.

Wherever a person struggles with a compulsion or with any tendency to serious splitting of the self, the mythic struggle of Dragon Slayer with Dragon is re-enacted. Man desires both wholeness and awareness. Obviously the kind of knowledge that is desired here is not "scientific" knowledge of an object, though it is quite probable that twentieth-century Western man finds this avenue the one he is forced to follow because of training and temperament. But the self which can be known "objectively" or empirically through the tools of search is not to be identified with the Self which is always implied as subject—the very Self which lies back of the wonder and curiosity which point to one's steps both into the laboratory and into poetry. That which can be "defined" is not the "Definer" though we tend to forget this in our eager search for empirical "causes." The search for "causes" will undoubtedly continue; but it can never displace the search for "meanings."

Loss of Innocence; Emergence of Loneliness

Light is a basic symbol in all of these myths of the Primal Sacrifice. It is the symbol of emerging consciousness, which in effect always says, "Let there be light!" The shoving apart of the World Parents is the recognition of the world, of an Other which stands over against one. Infant consciousness struggles up slowly out of the deep sea of unconscious. The Hero must reject the womb of darkness, separate the World Parents and move out of the world of the unconscious if he is to walk on his own feet and achieve individuation. Only in the light of consciousness can man come to awareness.

But this creative act is experienced by the growing person as a monstrous misdeed also. There is a loss of wholeness and of innocence which,

in the Christian tradition, has been described as original sin, or *sin of origin*, the sin of desiring to be separate. What this sectarian phrase points to is the vague sense of *guiltiness* which follows upon the creative deed.

This sense of loss of original innocence has been commented on by many students of early societies and tribes. The numerous rituals of washings found in early tribes, the concern with purification and baptisms of various kinds, were not based on a concern for hygiene. They apparently reflected the moments felt even by primitives when they tried to return to pristine innocence, when everything was all right.¹ When we come to a fairly late period of human history, that reflected in Orphism and Pythagoreanism, the devotee was taught that the original unity was broken by some pre-human act of aggression, which brought attendant guilt, guilt feelings and punishment.

The birth of ego consciousness, in the childhood of the race as in the life of the individual child today, brings with it many complex feelings—a sense of loss, a sense of guiltiness, and also the first sensations of loneliness. Since the child's critical faculties are very small, the lonely ego-to-be easily fixates on the negative feeling-tones involved in his experience of the Other.

The Semitic Tradition of Guilt

A glance at the theologies of Orient and Occident reveals that guilt and guilt feelings are much more marked in the Semitic religious tradition than in the Oriental traditions. Part of this is doubtless traceable to the difference in strength or force of guilt feelings within a matriarchal religious pattern and a predominantly patriarchal religious tradition; part is due to the different ways in which guilt feelings are handled in the matriarchy and the patriarchy.²

Most of the religions of the Far East have worshipped at the shrine

¹ Primitives tried to return to the state of innocence by periodically confessing their faults. Can we see, in this tendency toward purification, a nostalgia for the lost paradise of animality? Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, Pantheon, N. Y., 1954, p. 91.

² On some of the differences between "shame cultures" and "guilt cultures," see E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Beacon, Boston, 1957, ch. 2; Ian Suttie, *Origins of Love and Hate*, Julian, N. Y., 1952, ch. 9. In a matriarchal religion, the central mystery is that of fertility, birth and rebirth. In a patriarchal religion, the chief motif is the reaching for power; the central mystery revolves around the achieving of preferred status with the Father God. So far as written documents go, the history of religions has been largely a history of patriarchal religions since the matriarchies do not tend to produce histories. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are much more guilt-ridden than the religions of the Orient. This is shown by the part played by sacrifice in each. At the matriarchal level of religion, sacrifice is connected with the need for food. At the patriarchal level, sacrifice has become a sin offering, performed to propitiate the wrath of the Heavenly Father who looks upon insubordination as the cardinal sin.

of the Mother Goddess in one form or another. This holds for popular Hinduism, Mahayana Buddhism and Shinto. The peoples of these faiths are peoples without histories in the Western sense of the term, where concern with linear development and progress toward a goal are important. Matriarchal cultures and religions tend to be quiescent, non-aggressive. Patriarchal religions tend to be much more aggressive, usually claiming to have an "only way" and often stressing "chosenness." Freud grew up in a patriarchal tradition and was himself especially conscious of the child's conflict with the father. Hence the centrality of the Oedipus complex in all Freudian thinking and the stress upon what has been called "patriarchal repression." But the prior temptation to which infantile consciousness is subject is to seek union with the Great Nourisher, or to try to return to the remembered security of the womb.

Guilt feelings can arise in both matriarchal and patriarchal religions. However, in matriarchal religions, guilt feelings seem to have played a minor role. Fear of pollution seems to have been universal. Elaborate rules and regulations were built up to protect the members of the group from such pollution. If pollution was none the less picked up many practices were resorted to to cleanse one. In India and elsewhere such practices included refraining from eating, from breathing, from sexual intercourse, for longer or shorter periods.

With the emergence of religions putting chief stress on worship of the Father God, what had been minor became a major motif. By the sixth century B.C. in the Near East, a significant psychological change made itself felt among the people of the area. The fear of pollution seems to have become obsessive. Guilt feelings became much more pronounced, along with an increase preoccupation with the after-life.¹ The craving for ritual purification grew naturally out of the aggravated fear of pollution or contamination, a well-known sign of repressed guilt feelings.

In a strongly patriarchal family, stress falls on obedience to authority and honoring the parents, especially the Father. The more rigid the system, the more opportunity for the children to develop strong repressions. The pressure of unacknowledged desires—to displace the father, to deny the gods, etc.—is one of the most potent sources of guilt-feelings. So long

¹ See E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, for a treatment of how the Greeks gradually developed a sense of marked guilt. Among other things, he points out how in the Homeric version of Oedipus, Oedipus suffers no penalty or remorse and reigns in honor as king for many years. But in Sophocles' version, Oedipus is not only overcome with horror and guilt, but is also blinded, the symbol of castration and the result of marrying the Mother. Cf. E. Neumann's treatment of this theme in *The Great Mother*, Pantheon, N. Y., 1955.

as man could regard the irrational as caused by pollution, or fate, or the gods, he could handle his guilt feelings. But this method apparently failed man in the Mediterranean world. The *duality* which he had felt in his experience became outright *dualism*. Reason and analytical thinking generally undoubtedly contributed to this converting of the opposites into contradictories. In the Near East this second "Fall" was interpreted as due to the victory of instincts over thought, whereas in reality it was the victory of thought over instincts.¹

This change showed up in the Jewish religious and social pattern among other ways as a change in the attitude toward the whole feminine component in life. The Yahwist party in Israel, the group which edited the entire body of literature which came to be the Jewish Torah and historical books, sought to eliminate all signs of the feminine motif in religion. Baalism, or fertility cult religion, was to be rooted out entirely. Cold-blooded murder was justified in the eyes of these editors; Yahweh was to be worshipped as pure, arrogant maleness! The elements of nourishment, of pity and mercy, were ruthlessly excised. The God of most of the Old Testament books was to be concerned only with "justice" for his chosen people. The tenderness motif was repressed. The increasing priestly concern with the elaborate details of ceremonial and moral cleanliness suggests the operation of a tremendous amount of repressed material and its correlated guilt feelings. The more zealous the Jew, the more of a perfectionist he became, the more masochistic. A tightening of the regulations on the mixing of the sexes came about.² Virginity began to be praised. A group like the Essenes, with its repudiation of the world and sexual relations, could come into existence within the bounds of Judaism.

Underneath his confusions and compulsions Semitic man was still seeking an integrating experience and emotion. This need he projected in the form of his intense belief in one God. Unlike the infantile "monotheism" which centered in the experience of the Great Nourisher, this centered in a strictly masculine God, with all feminine elements repressed. Needing unity desperately, Semitic man got it conceptually in terms of this new monotheism. But a conceptual unity is a poor substitute for a total organismic unity, or a unified psyche. Concern for justice crowded out any appreciation for the quality of mercy. This paralleled what was happening in Greece where, in classical times, the proverbial saying was repeated, "All virtue is comprehended in justice" (Theognis 147);

¹ Cf. L. L. Whyte, *The Next Development in Man*, Holt, N. Y., 1948, pp. 92-93.

² See L. M. Epstein, *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism*, Bloch, 1948.

whereas in the time of the Iliad, Zeus pities the doomed Hector, even as he pities Achilles' horses mourning for their charioteer.¹

The Hebrew prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah—had much to say about justice, and with Hosea something about love. But not a one came up with any profound psychological analysis of man's deep-seated inner split.

What did Christianity have to offer when it came on the scene? Students of the Mediterranean world have suggested that the feeling of guilt seems to have reached a crisis shortly before the emergence of Christianity. What lay back of this is still a matter of speculation and investigation.² The good which the Christian sensed he was destined for, he thought of as the act of a personal God. Thus he followed the Jewish pattern of theism. His own uncomfortable sense of being evil, his addictions, his fleshly appetites, he personified as demons, evil spirits and Satan.

The Christian was willing to qualify his monotheism in order to lessen, to some extent, his inner sense of tension and his intense feeling of cut-off-ness. The idea of God as a governor, judge, authoritarian parent, was supplemented by the idea of a mediator. The mediator took upon himself man's guilt. The Jew, under the impact of Christian persecutions, went on carrying his own guilt feelings, trying to make them more palatable to himself by glorying in them. That is, he said, "I am chosen for suffering in order that all mankind may eventually be led to true religion, to monotheism."³

The Christian, on the other hand, settled for a middle man, a mediator who "did it all," once for all. The demands of justice were toned down by an act of mercy.

Popular Roman Catholicism added a good many other lesser mediatorial agents, including the Mother Goddess herself, Queen of Heaven and of the Angels, in the guise of the mother of Jesus. The Christian was thus given an opportunity to get rid of part of his sense of guilt. Thus

¹ Cf. Iliad 21. "I care about them, though they perish." Dodds, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

² In addition to Dodds, see Gerald Heard, *Is God in History?*, Harper, N. Y., 1950; L. L. Whyte, *The Next Development in Man*; T. Reik, *Myth and Guilt*.

³ Reik holds (*Myth and Guilt*, p. 391) that the Jewish attitude which insists on justice being done, is a form of defiant and obstinate masochism. Hence the threat posed by the leniency of Jesus, "The pulling down of the severe laws filled the pious with the dark fear of temptation. In the heretic Nazarene they condemned their own temptation to throw off the yoke of the rituals and ceremonials of their religiousness." In rejecting Christianity "the Jews unconsciously refused to accept a poor gesture of reconciliation from His side." They insisted on their right to be treated as His chosen people. Better to be important to God as objects of His wrath "than looked upon by Him with kind indifference" (*Ibid.*, pp. 393-94).

he achieved a partial recovery in some cases. The Christian was told he could get victory over sin, the sense of alienation, guilt if he would achieve mystical union with the dying and rising Christ. The Mass, or the Lord's Supper, became the ritual occasion where this timeless event was supposed to take place.

Neither Christianity nor Judaism found the medicine to heal man's aggravated guilt feelings and his inner lesion. For both traditions fell into the dualism of *spirituality* versus *sensuality*. So far as the weaknesses of the flesh were concerned, the Christian fathers tended to be harsher than the Old Testament legalists. A strong leader like Moses, in spite of the opposition, had got his followers to accept his "Thou shalt not's," and got them accepted as coming from on high, just as Hammurabi had with his law code. Jesus broke with the rigidities of this legalism but was never able to do more than *forgive* the flesh; flesh and blood were not to inherit the Kingdom he talked about. Unfortunately, many of his followers were to interpret this to mean that denying oneself at the level of sensate living meant self-castration, both literally and symbolically.¹

The apostle Paul was conditioned by the dualism prevailing in his time and in some of his writings tended to distort it further with a biting, judgmental approach to common human failings. In some of the later Christian writers, the weaknesses of the flesh received more attention than weaknesses of the mind or spirit. With Augustine the Western tradition was to stress that man's Fall from paradise was due to pride. According to Augustine, two of the consequences of man's sin of overreaching himself were man's loss of true knowledge of his highest good and loss of satisfaction. Because man does not know where his true good lies, he is doomed to search in the wrong places and with the wrong motivation. Man's loss of genuine satisfaction was described by Augustine under the term lust. Lust is the complete disordering of desires which leads one into increasing confusion and frustration. Man fritters away his life in fragmentary pursuits.

It is not necessary to accept Augustine's language, or his accompanying theory of the church, to recognize that he has touched a universal human problem in his analysis at points. Hindu and Buddhist experimenters in the realm of human psychology had also commented on man's anxiety or spiritual disorientation, with its attendant disordering of desires. The most obvious area in which the symptoms of man's anxiousness

¹ Cf. Apocryphal Gospel to the Egyptians where Jesus is quoted as saying, "I am come to destroy the work of the female."

reveal themselves to public gaze is the mouth.¹ When an adult is vaguely anxious, unhappy or emotionally disturbed, one of his first tendencies is to put something into his mouth. With a child, it is his thumb. With an adult who is similarly confused or ill at ease, drinking, eating or smoking may play the same role. At the core of every neurotic's confused search for his true good will be found some ritual of compulsive drinking, smoking or drug taking. The immature person likewise is an inordinant consumer; he must be continually "fed." This generation has been termed a generation of sucklings.

Since food and drink are central to the survival of the human organism from infancy onward, it is natural that food and drink become the symbols of man's highest good. The new-born infant's first specific sense is probably that of a vague-urge-seeking-something. His first recurring pangs are associated with this seeking. At the heart of every traditional religious ritual is the act of eating or drinking, or both. Eating the god is both an ancient and a modern phenomenon, looked at psychologically.

"Give us this day our daily bread" is a universal petition. One of the Hindu Upanishads states:

"From food all creatures are produced,
All creatures that dwell on earth.
By food they live
And into food they finally pass.
Food is the chief among beings,
Therefore they call it the panacea.
Verily he obtains all food
Who worships Brahma as food. . . ."
(Taittiriya Up. 2.2)

The central ritual of Christianity underscores this same emphasis. Mother Church provides the divine breast, the wine and the wafer which *are* the blood and body of the god. In the words of an early Christian writer, the Eucharist is the "medicine of immortality." We are directed by the god himself to "take, eat." The ritual act of putting something into the mouth "in remembrance of Me" (i.e., the Primal Unity) is a reminder of the source of all nourishment; it is recapitulated over and over again outside traditionally sacred precincts as well as within them.

¹ If the infant could draw, probably his first God-picture would be of a great mouth—his own—or a great vessel—the breast of the Great Nourisher.

If traditional religion has often failed to guide people into experiences of genuine integration, this is in part because religion—like many a doctor—treats only the symptoms. Sometimes the prescriptions of the theologians have even exaggerated the symptoms. For example, Western Christian man who was already aware of some real inner “split” was encouraged to aggravate the split. He was called to cultivate something called “spirituality” while stamping out something called “sensuality.” Inner duality became an acute dualism. Western man made no serious efforts to find out what Eastern man might have discovered in this area of human experience. He naïvely assumed that all other religions were inferior to his own. Because of this self-imposed isolation, he did not become aware of the fact that there were religious traditions which had not specialized in aggravating the dualism of flesh and spirit. As one result, he came to claim that man’s sickness and guilt lay exclusively in man’s hereditary constitution. He failed to ask whether the sickness might not have been aggravated by his tradition.¹ Thus the dualism became sanctified and was baptized with holy water. The “spiritual,” so conceived, was to prove quite as distorting as its opposite; and a whole-natured response was not possible.

Theodore Reik on Guilt Feelings

If the traditional Christian answer has as often confused the psychological picture as it may have helped, is there light from other sources that may illumine the problem of man’s guilt feelings? The idea of a cosmic Fall which has infected all creation, as Christianity has claimed, is purely speculative. As the biologist, E. W. Sinnott, has pointed out, certainly the pain suffered by the rest of the animal creation can hardly be explained by either Adam’s transgression or our own.² Much pain may be a kind of retribution for violating basic laws of life, but we have no empirical basis for saying all pain is.

Modern psychoanalysis has had its try at explaining guilt feelings. Theodore Reik contends that there is a world sense of guilt, “a free-floating guilt feeling in all men . . . a collective sense of guilt” which only occasionally reaches the threshold of conscious feeling.³ “We are all accused of some crime by an invisible judge and we are not told what it is,”

¹ Cf. L. L. Whyte, *The Next Development in Man*.

² *Matter, Mind & Man*, Harper, New York, 1957, p. 196.

³ *Myth and Guilt*, Braziller, N. Y., 1957, p. 41. He appeals to the religions of Babylonia, and of Egypt as well as to Christianity. He points out how some tribes had rituals for trying to change their former enemies into friends after death.

says Reik. The crime was that of the sons overthrowing the father and subsequently eating him. Reik sees a parallel here to the biblical story of Adam in the Garden of Eden. Adam ate his God-Father, the tree, the totemistic god. Adam's motive was to take God's place.¹

A Roman Catholic writer, Victor White, sees in this Freudian myth of a primeval parricide, in which the brothers slew the Father, a weird secularization of the Genesis story. "For here the collective Man (Adam) indeed slays his Father, in the sense that he kills the divine life of the God within him, usurps his power ('ye shall be as God') and takes possession of his own soul—the *anima* which God has made to be his companion."²

Reik goes on to point out that a basic principle of man's psyche seems to be "you are whom you eat." Certainly in early cannibalism, it seems to be assumed that one acquires the qualities of the victim by eating his flesh and drinking his blood. More than a hint of this is to be found in the ritual of the Lord's Supper where the force of the appeal of the ritual is to the unconscious, not to the conscious mind. The lover's desire to bite, eat, possess the beloved is probably a reflection of the same principle at work in the psyche.

However, in the case of Adam, the eaten object "bites back." The word remorse comes from *re-mordere*, to bite back. "Remorse" arises from the dead father who proves to be not quite dead: he bites back. Hence man's guilt feelings.

Our concern is not with the alleged historicity of the original cannibalistic meal. Reik holds that it happened over and over again. Surely this is at least a *psychological* event that happens over and over again, with every generation and every child. There is ample evidence from child-psychology clinics and from adult-counselling sessions that the child does seek to displace the parent, and the child does have very strong aggressive tendencies toward the parent. Normally the child has to suppress these tendencies. Reik holds that the origin of guilt feelings is in the area of the aggression instincts. Repressed aggressiveness is transformed into guilt feelings, he claims. "Guilt feeling is the result of unconscious temptation . . . that special kind of anxiety awakened by the pressure of rejected drives; that means it is *temptation anxiety*."³

¹ The Freudian identification of tree, upright stone, a male principle, and Father-God is not modern. It is explicitly expressed in the ancient Vedic tradition of India.

² Victor White, *op. cit.*, p. 171 footnote.

³ Reik, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

Thus Reik rejects the notion that guilt feelings can be traced back to sexual transgression. Yet the guilt feelings have tended to cluster around sexual activities since this has been the point where the instinctual tendencies have been so often slapped down by the parents. The child suppresses or represses his aggressive tendencies which arise as a result of the slapping down, and this "indirectly increases guilt feeling because the temptation strengthens the unconscious hostility against the prohibiting persons or laws."¹ In India it would appear that the aggressive tendencies are directed against one's own person primarily, as with ascetics generally. In the Western societies, the aggressive tendencies have been directed outwardly perhaps more often than inwardly. In either case, personality development is distorted and certain "virtues" take the place of genuine growth in maturity.

A Tentative Conclusion on Guilt Feelings

When traditional Christian orthodoxy and psychoanalysis can agree on anything, it is not to be passed over lightly, for neither side can be accused of trying to pull the other's fat out of the fire. Both positions agree in saying that guilt feelings were not the invention of the priesthood, and that the "sin of origin" had a corporate aspect.

One thing seems certain. The source of the person's sense of "original guiltiness" is transpersonal. That is, initially it has nothing to do with a conscious act done by a responsible person, for which the person is culpable. What the person is aware of is not guilt but guilt *feeling*. The infant that bites the mother is not culpable though he can easily be made to *feel* culpable by the attitude taken by the offended mother.²

The accusation of guiltiness comes from the depths of the growth process. The child is unconsciously setting himself over against the world, including the parents, having already sensed an Other. Ego-consciousness is emerging. It involves a tearing, rending or dismemberment as the myth well illustrates. It is the very nature of consciousness to take to pieces, to

¹ Reik p. 239. "The increase in guilt feelings during sexual abstinence is due to the rising hostility and rage against the forbidding authorities" (*Ibid.*).

² The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines guilt as "the having committed a specified or implied offence; criminality; culpability." Drever's Dictionary of Psychology defines it as "a sense of wrong-doing, an emotional attitude, generally involving emotional conflict, arising out of a real or imagined contravention or moral or social standards, in act or thought." The former definition is an objective one, the kind that would please the moralist and lawyer; the latter is a subjective one stressing the feeling of the subject. It is really a definition of guilt feeling. Cf. Victor White, O. P., "Guilt: Theological and Psychological, *Christian Essays in Psychiatry*, ed. by P. Mairet, Phil. Library, N. Y., 1956, pp. 156-57.

define an Other and then many Others as the process continues. The process involves pain or agony, including the agony of loneliness. The drama of the Dragon and the Dragon Slayer goes on.

The sense of original guilt, like the young child's accusation against himself when deserted by the mother, comes from the depths of the unconscious. Therefore society cannot touch the problem by legislation, nor religion by formulating a code of ethics. But the problem should be tackled by the parents, by the nursery-school teachers, and by all persons sensitive enough to deal with the very young without projecting too many of their own unresolved problems into the situation. So many of us adults were dealt with so poorly by our own parents or guardians of the nursery that we are crippled before we try to deal with our own children.

"But the hardest frost of a year
Will not arrest the growing world
As blame and the memory of wrong will do."¹

Too many of us adults have been arrested by just such memories. Being unable to forgive our own parents, we continue to blame them beyond any reasonable limit and thus project our own problems onto our children.

So far as basic guilt feelings are concerned, we have also concluded that they are common to man as man. Thus they transcend particular cultures and religions. However, the exaggerated guilt feelings of the Semitic tradition are the by-product of a distorting tradition, it would seem. They are not to be taken as normative for man as man. The guilt feelings common to humanity are the by-product of the emergence of ego-consciousness and of the first efforts to cut the psychological navel cord which binds one to the Great Nourisher, the symbol of warmth, womb and security. When the individual is forced out of the Garden of Innocence, primal oneness and security, he feels not only deprived but also betrayed.²

This betrayal, with the accompanying feelings of resentment, loneliness and guiltiness, all intertwined, leaves its deepest mark. These rudimentary guilt feelings, though the by-products of normal human evolu-

¹ Christopher Fry, *The Dark is Light Enough*.

² It is quite possible that the feeling of being betrayed is less strong where the child is not so much *driven* from the Garden through the unconscious co-operation of the personal mother and father, but is allowed at a more leisurely tempo to seek the Garden gate. The primal-we of mother-child must give way as the ego of the child takes shape. Can this process be guided in such a way as to minimize the degree of guilt? We aggravate the guilt feelings of the infant in our culture through the use of play-pens and perambulators, depriving the child of the important sense of body-contact. The child's sense of aloneness must be considerably increased through such practices, probably increasing also the child's guilt feelings.

tion, must not be allowed to put their roots down too deeply into the human psyche. Where they do because of inadequate educational insights and techniques, they produce not only sick persons who will limp throughout their lives. They also tend to produce a sick tradition which goes on aggravating the initial trauma. One of the key functions of education is to help growing persons know what they ought to feel responsible for, and thus what they ought to feel guilty about. Defenders of "peculiar institutions" that have outlived their day and imperil the total fabric of human society on a shrinking planet are to be found in all societies and nations. Our criticisms of capitalism, communism, conservatism, radicalism, ecclesiasticism, anarchism must become much more persistent and penetrating than they have been, if we are to grapple with fundamental *human* issues and not peripheral *tribal* issues. So long as we have not faced our guilt feelings and the darker side of our human nature objectively, dispassionately, we shall go on projecting them haphazardly onto the Negro, the Jew, the Russian, the Oriental or anybody else who happens to remind us of our own unfinished business within.

Eric Severeid speaks with insight when he observes that he does not believe all this front-page talk about controlling the earth from the moon. "If neither men nor gadgets nor both combined can control the earth from the earth, we fail to see how they will do so from the moon. It is exciting talk . . . but one little step in man's advance toward man . . . would be truly exciting. Let those who wish, try to discover the composition of a lunar crater; we would settle for discovering the true mind of a Russian commissar or the inner heart of a delinquent child."¹

Until man can control himself through knowing himself better—including his guilt feelings and his darker side—the lunge into outer space should rightly fill us with fear and trembling as well as wonder and excitement. The call to find the straight way and the narrow gate to human reunion was never so pressing as now.

¹ Eric Severeid, in a CBS radio broadcast.

III

MAN, WOMAN, AND MATURITY

The Evening at your house
Is the Morning at mine;
We break bread in the one,
In the other have Wine.
But never leave either
To the dust and the chill,
For each House is holy,
And worship we will.

—ROBERT A. SANBORN

The main drift in the life of European man since about the time of Aristotle has been in the direction of pitting man against himself and against his world. Man came to believe that he was "a house divided against itself" wherein a battle raged between the forces of good and the forces of evil. Man as creature felt himself to be far removed from God as creator. His thinking inevitably became dominated by either/or. With the help of Aristotle's logic he sought to prove to himself that everything had to be either A or not-A, B or not-B; there was no middle ground. To know his world, he became increasingly dependent on concepts. In a world that had fallen in two, the concept was to serve as a kind of mediator between the knowing subject and the unknown object.

The split in man was also reflected in the form which the prevailing religion took. Man as subject felt himself far removed from God as Object. Thus a mediator was called for. An almost obsessive compulsion to define the concepts relating to the personal savior's mediatorial role led to the bitter debates of the general councils of the church from that at Nicaea in 325 well past the Council of Chalcedon in 451.

Subsequent centuries were to show clearly that neither logic, philosophy nor a religion supplying a Savior could save man from his unredeemed condition; that is, his dividedness and loneliness. Man was to continue living his life haunted by the sense of his lost wholeness, dogged by loneliness coupled with the feeling of not being truly alone. With the poet he sensed

There are wolves in the next room waiting
With heads bent low, thrust out, breathing
At nothing in the dark: between them and me
A white door patched with light from the hall
Where it seems never (so still is the house)
A man has walked from the front door to the stair.

It has all been forever. A beast claws the floor.

...

Now while

I have looked for the evening star at a cold window

...

I've heard the wolves scuffle, and said: So this

Is man. . . .

go to the door,

Open it and see whether coiled on the bed

Or cringing by the wall a savage beast

Maybe with golden hair, with dark eyes

Like a bearded spider on a sunlit floor,

Will snarl—and man can never be alone.¹

A World in Opposition

Mankind's feeling of living in a world of opposites is reflected in the numerous myths describing the wars between the gods and the titans, the angels and the devils. Both early man and later European man were accurate reporters of human experience in recognizing the actuality of opposites at work within; but they were poor interpreters and orthodox religion in the West proved of little help here. The attitude with which one deals with the polarity, or opposition, may be crucial in determining whether one becomes a split personality or moves in the direction of mature reconciliation of the opposing tendencies.

Novelist, biologist, psychologist, and theologian all find evidence in the world of the operation of the opposites. In the words of the novelist, "The human spirit seems to be dragged in two opposite directions. The drag of the past is towards repetition, stagnation, and peace—peace of fidelity to tradition, of obedience to authority, peace which is really decay. The other drag is towards anxiety and effort—the effort of constantly rejecting the letter of the law and reasserting the spirit. This involves a constant dying, accompanied by a constant rebirth."²

The biologist observes in nature the operation of two laws, the second law of thermodynamics (the tendency of energy to fall to lower levels, the "running down" of the universe); and the law of organization, the "building up" process observable in the cell.³ Freud spoke of a death urge alongside of the life urge. Orthodox Christianity spoke of Satan working against God. A physicist may speak of two opposing tendencies in matter,

¹ Allen Tate, "The Wolves," *A Little Treasury of Modern Poetry*, Oscar Williams, ed., Scribner's, N. Y., 1946.

² L. H. Myers, *The Root and the Flower*, Cape, London, 1936, p. 317.

³ E. W. Sinnott, *op. cit.*

one toward order and the other toward disorder. All of these are different descriptive interpretations of observed polarities.

In man this polarity expresses itself, among other ways, as the drive for security and the drive for adventure. Out of his fear of insecurity, many a person unconsciously makes a pact with security. This involves succumbing to some external authority, mother, father, dictator or public opinion. The compulsion for conformity seems to be a defense-mechanism against feelings of insecurity. It leads to guilt feelings for an equally strong need is being denied, the need for insecurity or adventure.

Guilt feelings may thus arise as warning signals that one is being false to the deeper levels of the psyche. They signify that one is not living up to an important part of his potential. To persist in infantile attitudes and relationships beyond the proper point is to lay the groundwork for authentic guilt feelings. For man is not only a creature trailing a long past. He is also a creature capable of growth, indefinite growth. He is not only acted upon by life forces; he can also initiate actions. He is capable of participating creatively in the life process. In the language of the myth, the Hero accepts the responsibility of growth. There is a journey to be undertaken. There is an obstacle to be surmounted. There is a prize to be won.

After the expulsion from the Garden and the emergence of ego consciousness, suffering has become very real. One can face this experience of pain morbidly, hopelessly, or confidently. If he faces it morbidly, he will probably downgrade himself and upgrade God, the church or some other external authority. He may lay the foundations for an elaborate ecclesiastical system (Augustine) or violently attack the ecclesiastical system (Kierkegaard); but in any event he will have little respect for man or his potentialities.

If one approaches the problem of suffering with an attitude of hopelessness, at best he will commit suicide as soon as he has the nerve, and at worst he will grit his teeth and growl from now till eternity. This is the bloody-but-unbowed-head attitude reflected in the poem *Invictus*.

If one accepts the suffering as a challenge to grow, he can develop increasing confidence as he engages in the journey of life.

"Much of your pain is self-chosen.

It is the bitter potion by which the physician
Within you heals your sick self.

Therefore trust the physician, and drink his
remedy in silence and tranquillity. . . ."¹

¹ Kahlil Gibran, *The Prophet*, Knopf, N. Y., 1943, pp. 60-61.

Only if we approach the problem of suffering from this third perspective does it seem reasonably possible to avoid the danger of selling out either to authoritarian institutions which presume to speak for God, or succumbing to a form of morbidity which is bound to lead sooner or later to alcoholism, drug addiction and a riotous pursuit of sensations. The suffering is quite real, and may be aggravated by the particular culture in which one is reared. But the challenge is to find deeper meaning in this world of opposites.

The Movement Toward Maturity

What is now termed man's search for integration or maturity is known in the traditions of mankind as the attempt to reconcile the opposites. We hear much about the developmental tasks of the growing child. However, there are equally important developmental tasks which every adult must face and work through if he is to grow spiritually or psychologically.

In the language of mankind's myths this is known as the Journey of the Hero. The Hero has a thousand faces, reflecting the diverse cultural patterns of the past, but his task is everywhere the same—the search for maturity through the facing of real dangers. The prize may be described as “the pearl of great price” or the beautiful maiden whose hand must be won by heroic deeds. But the pilgrimage is one; it takes place in the life of Everyman who refuses to live focussed exclusively on security or the infantile pleasures of the Garden of Eden.¹

The woman as well as the man must make this pilgrimage but, as the following examination of the myths will show, the feminine Hero fights the Dragon in her own way and the masculine Hero in his. Since each person has something of the opposite sex in himself, it is possible for men and women to understand something of each other's pilgrimage of faith and adventure. Deeper than our sexual differentiation is our human oneness. The task is to find it.

¹ In the traditions of the past the hero has been known by such names as Mahavira (Great Hero), Tathagata (He who has arrived), Buddha (the Illumined One), Christ (the Anointed One). Some modern labels are the mature person, the integrated personality, individuation. Joseph Campbell, in his *Hero With a Thousand Faces*, Pantheon, N. Y., 1949, pp. 19-20, describes the hero as “the man or woman who has been able to battle past his personal and local historical limitations to the generally valid, normally human forms. Such a one's vision, ideas, and inspirations come pristine from the primary springs of human life and thought.” In a traditional society there was both a dogma and a ritual to guide the seeker. In a non-traditional society one must learn to recognize the call in his own tongue or idiom.

The Masculine Hero

Even without looking at the myths, it is possible to trace historically and sociologically to some extent how, for the males, individual consciousness became heroic enough to stand on its own feet. It was in opposition to the prevailing matriarchy of the tribe and its correlated matriarchal type of religion, worship of the Mother Goddess.

Matriarchy was the first natural grouping of mankind. It grew out of simple biological facts, including man's ignorance of his part in the procreative process. Whereas the matriarchy is a biological phenomenon, totemism is a sociological phenomenon. Totemism is founded. Furthermore, it is founded *by* males only *for* males only. It reflects the need of the males to band together in order to find mutual reinforcement in their struggle with female authority.

The males take as their central symbol some animal which has qualities they covet for themselves—moose, elk, lion, bear, or badger. (No Ancient Accepted Order of Mice has ever been uncovered by research.) This animal they regard as a common ancestor in some sense. The legendary founder, or idealized priest-prophet-father, is the totem. The ancestor is always male and reflects "masculine" values. Through identification with the common totemic ancestor, a Father God, the males begin to win their freedom from the Mother Goddess and from the rule of the women. At a certain age all boys in the tribe are snatched from their mothers in some dramatic ritual. They undergo initiation which is kept a dark secret from the women. There is some rite of blood-letting, often including the ritual of circumcision. When the lad has undergone all the prescribed trials and rituals, he is declared to be a *man*. He no longer lives with the mothers.¹

As totemism becomes more firmly entrenched, matriarchal religion is supplanted by patriarchal religion. A masculine god displaces the Mother Goddess. A monotheism centered in the Father God begins to develop; the memory of the original "maternal monotheism" is repressed. Gods cast in the image of the males begin to be worshipped both by the men and the women.

In short, the primary need which totemism seeks to satisfy is the *strengthening of masculine consciousness*. A male Hero is central. Abra-

¹ Cf. Mircea Eliade, *Birth and Rebirth*, Harper, N. Y., 1958. In some cases subincision was also practiced. That is, each boy was given a small "mock" vagina on the under side of his sex organs. Was this a way of saying in effect to the women, we have everything you have and more besides? Ian Suttie would see in this further evidence of the role played by "pregnancy envy" in the subconscious of the male. Freud was himself so thoroughly oriented in the patriarchal direction that he could see only "penis envy."

ham, Moses, Mahavira, Buddha, Christ are all totemic symbols to their followers initially. (The "feminization" of some of these heroes, as with Christ, always occurs later and under the pressure of a reassertion of the matriarchal consciousness, a return of the repressed.) Moses by affinity to Yahweh acquires many of the features of Yahweh as Lawgiver. Christ, in the earliest period regarded as the adopted son of God, becomes a *full* Son, and then God Himself. In these historical developments which can be traced in the case of both these religions, male consciousness is striving to achieve cosmic status. The feminine component in the male psyche is being dethroned or suppressed. The males make bold to assume that femininity has been banished!¹

Change in Creation Myths and in Attitude Toward Women

With the overthrow of the matriarchy in a religion consequent upon the emergence of strengthened masculine consciousness, the creation myths of mankind undergo drastic changes, and man's attitude toward woman changes. The two matters are intimately related at the deeper psychological level.

Early man worshipped woman in her fertility features. This is not only shown by the carvings coming from relatively late periods in the history of religions, in Indian temples for example where statues of the Mother Goddess are far more numerous than statues of male gods; but also in the more primitive carvings coming from the Aurignacian period. The numerous statuettes of women from this archæological stratum show all the sexual features greatly exaggerated. Also many vulvas, or yonis (ring stones), are found but no phalli whatsoever. By the Magdalenian period, in contrast, a large number of phalli are found, but only a few vulvas.²

¹ Through the rites and symbols of totemism the ego consciousness is trying to say, "I and the heavenly Father are one." To the degree that the heroic consciousness can identify with the "heavenly principle" as over against the "earthly principle," it is able to stand erect, pushing the heavens and the earth farther apart, and to walk on its own feet. The god, or the god-like hero, who is worshipped from afar, never existed literally in the form in which it or he is believed in. But the god, or the god-like hero, plays an indispensable function in the emergence of consciousness. Every generation must identify with idealized heroes, whether of the past or the present. Only gradually, and even then under guidance, does the individual person come to discover that the gods and the heroes have clay feet, or that indeed in the form in which they were originally believed in they were the products of human need.

² Cf. Simone De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*.

Heinrich Zimmer, *The Art of Indian Asia*, Vol. 1, Ch. 2, also Plates A8 and A9. See also Volume 2 for numerous representations of the Mother Goddess.

At the patriarchal level of psychological development, man turns to worshipping his own fertility or potency, not the fertility of woman. Upright stones, some realistic and some more symbolic, the pillars referred to in many of the Old Testament books, the lingams which figure prominently in many Hindu temples, are all ways in which the males dramatized their preoccupation with their new-found potency. The ithyphallic gods of later Egypt are another evidence of the same development. Phallic worship is as old as the patriarchy and as modern as present-day man's obsession with powerful automobiles, machines and the bomb.

Symbols which were originally feminine were taken over by the males. In ancient India the lotus was the feminine symbol *par excellence*. In the words of the Satapatha Brahmana, "The lotus leaf is the womb." It was the symbol of self-creation, emerging from the maternal waters of the deep. In ancient Indian carvings the Mother Goddess is often shown seated on a lotus throne. However, after the patriarchy of the Indo-European peoples who invaded ancient India superseded the matriarchal patterns of the indigenous peoples, Vishnu, a male god, is pictured in stone carvings giving birth to Brahma, creator of the present universe. The birth takes place from Vishnu's navel, *which is a lotus*. The womb was taken away from the Mother Goddess! The Mother Goddess, shrunk in size, sits at the feet of the reclining Vishnu, stroking them in a proper dutiful fashion. In numerous other carvings on temple walls, the priority of the masculine principle is dramatized where Vishnu is shown as the Cosmic Boar rescuing the diminutive Mother Goddess.¹

It is interesting to note in passing that the Hebrew word applied to Yahweh to indicate his mercifulness comes from a root meaning *womb*.

Not only in India but elsewhere the creation stories are reshaped in terms of the priority of masculine consciousness and potency. Many of the more realistic creation stories at the patriarchal level have creation spurted forth from the male phallus itself.² Moving or spurting waters generally seem to be identified with the male procreative thrust, whereas standing waters in the myths tend to be feminine. Later, creation is conceived as taking place in the mouth. The Satapatha Brahmana creation story relates:

¹ The feminine tradition still maintained some autonomy, for in other carvings Durga, one of the very popular forms of the Mother Goddess, is shown in pursuit of the Titan Buffalo or in the act of slaying him.

² See E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Vol. 5, pp. 163-176. See illustrations 168-184. Also see Pyramid Text, spell 1248, of which part is given in Neumann, *Origins and History of Consciousness*, p. 19.

"While the waters were performing austerities, a golden egg came into existence. It then became a year. . . . From it in a year a man came into existence, who was Prajapati (Lord of Creation). . . . He conceived progeny in himself; with his mouth he created gods."

At a more sophisticated level of development still, creation comes forth from the mouth as Breath, Word, or Logos. The breath, or wind, is equated with the fructifying act of the Father God.

The Babylonian story of creation is illuminating. Marduk has to fight Tiamat, the Waters of the Deep, the Great Mother. Having cut her into pieces, he still has to pass a crucial test: Can he himself create?

Then the gods placed a garment in their midst;
To Marduk, their firstborn, they said:
"Verily, O Lord, thy destiny is supreme among the gods,
Command 'to destroy and to create,' (and) it shall be!
By the word of thy mouth let the garment be destroyed;
Command again, and let the garment be whole!"
He commanded with his mouth and the garment was destroyed.
Again he commanded, and the garment was restored.
When the gods, his fathers, beheld the efficacy of his word,
They rejoiced (and) did homage (saying), "Marduk is King!"¹

The transferring of the act of creation from the Mother Goddess to a male god reflects something of a latent male envy for the female's "natural" creativity.² Woman can produce from the womb, but look at the male gods—they can create from their mouths, by the spoken word! Many religious traditions reflect this. In the Hebrew tradition God creates merely by saying, "Let there be light," and immediately there was light. Christian scripture says, "In the beginning was the Logos" (or Word). In the Hindu tradition it is stated that "On the Spoken Word (Vach, or Vac) all the gods depend, all beasts and men. . . . The Word is the imperishable, the firstborn of the eternal Law, the mother of the Vedas, the navel of the divine world."³ From the Uitoto Indians comes the legend, "In the beginning the Word gave the Father his origin."⁴

¹ Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, Enuma Elish, Tablet IV.

² Ian Suttie has quite a bit to say in his volume, *Origins of Love and Hate*, about the male's "pregnancy envy."

³ Taittiriya Brahmana, 2, 8, 8, 4.

⁴ From Preuss, *Religion and Mythologie der Uitoto*, 1, 25f, II, 659, quoted in Cassirer, *Language and Myth*, ch. 4.

In assigning the function of birth or creation to the male deity, that is, to the masculine side of consciousness, the males won an apparent victory. However, deep insecurity feelings persisted just below the surface. This is reflected in the absurd lengths to which the pro-male law codes go to keep women in a subordinate place. The codes of Hammurabi (Babylonia), Manu (India), and Moses are so thoroughly in the man's favor that a modern student finds it very hard to understand how so many millions of people for so many centuries could have accepted them as being handed down by deity. Where was man's sense of humor when the Law of Manu prescribed that a woman should worship her husband as a god, no matter how worthless he might be?¹ The way was being unwittingly prepared for a violent revolution both against male sovereignty and against such uncritical supernaturalism.

Once the Mother Goddess is dethroned and the Father God is put in her place, man's attitude toward woman herself changed.² Whereas once he had regarded her as *sacred*, now he came to regard her as *impure*. Her natural creativity as reflected in the lunar cycle aroused his own envy, thus constituting a threat to his ego; so he wrote elaborate rules around the woman's blood mysteries, rules which probably had nothing to do with hygiene but which reflected the unresolved problems in his own psyche.

The male did not know what to do with the female. Neither did he know what to do with his own feminine component, for he experienced it ambivalently. On the one hand he seems to have been primarily impressed with its de-masculinizing, enervating element; thus he made a fetish of his cry for justice and had no room for mercy. (This has more recently been called the "Taboo against tenderness.") On the other hand, he was profoundly attracted by the feminine component, at least as projected out on the world of femininity, and it led him to engage in many exploits and adventures. Thus it was also a spur to creativity and exploration.

¹ Cf. the Padmapurana: There is no other god on earth for a woman than her husband. The most excellent of all good works that she can do is to seek to please him by manifesting perfect obedience to him. . . . Be her husband deformed, aged, infirm, offensive in his manner; let him be choleric, debauched, immoral, a drunkard, a gambler; let him frequent places of ill-repute, live in open sin with other women, have no affection for his home . . . , a wife must always look upon him as her god, should lavish him with all her affection and care, paying no heed whatsoever to his character and giving him no cause whatsoever for disapproval." Cited in John Noss, *Man's Religions*, Macmillan, N. Y., 1956, p. 228.

² Fromm states that Freud eliminated the mother figure in psychology; Luther had previously eliminated her in the European Protestant tradition of religion. The residual deposit of the Mother Goddess in Lutheranism took the form of the stress on salvation by *grace*, an unmerited gift. This softened the harsh patriarchal note of predestinarianism in Lutheran and Calvinistic thought.

The male's tendency to regard the woman as property, to be bought and sold, testified to his own basic insecurity in face of woman. Not understanding either himself or her, he sought to subdue her, dominate her. Often frustrated in these efforts, aware of woman only as Temptress—the favorite word of many a monk for woman—he fled into asceticism with its parallel tendency to regard the world of matter as evil. Earth, matter, *mater* and mother all tended to coalesce in his feeling. In asceticism the male seeks to declare his total independence of the woman. The Christian monk found many a good biblical argument, climaxed by his appeal to the non-married state of Jesus, to support his driving need. Many a woman was to follow the men into asceticism, and monasticism. When the woman did this, it was in basic violation of her own deepest nature.¹

Extreme asceticism associated with a flight from woman as Temptress is much older than Christianity. Pythagoras taught "there is a good principle, which has created order, light and man; and a bad principle which has created chaos, darkness and woman." Tertullian could shout, "Woman! You are the gateway of the devil. You persuaded him whom the devil dared not attack directly. Because of you the Son of God had to die. You should always go dressed in mourning and rags." In another passage he describes her as "a temple built over a sewer."²

Bishop Ambrose stated that "Adam was led to sin by Eve and not Eve by Adam. It is just and right that woman accept as lord and master him whom she led to sin." Augustine reflected this same idea when he wrote, "We could not be tempted by the devil except through the medium of this part of the psyche which reveals itself as an image or a type of woman in one and the same man."³ Thomas Aquinas held that woman is only an incomplete being; "man is above woman as Christ is above man." This was in the tradition of Paul the Apostle.

This marked downgrading of woman *as woman* was paralleled by her theological upgrading. Virginity was praised fulsomely by most of the

¹ "The devaluation of woman represents a necessary stage in the history of humanity, for it is not upon her positive value but upon man's weakness that her prestige is founded. In woman are incarnated the disturbing mysteries of nature, and man escapes her hold when he frees himself from nature. It is the advance from stone to bronze that enables him through his labor to gain mastery of the soil and to master himself. . . . Man learns his power. In the relation of his creative arm to the fabricated object he experiences causation: planted grain may or may not germinate, but metal always reacts in the same way to fire, to tempering, to mechanical treatment. This world of tools could be embraced within clear concepts: rational thought, logic, and mathematics could now appear." Simone De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, p. 75.

² Cf. Augustine's statement, "Inter faeces et urinam nascimur."

³ De gen. contra Manich. II, XVIII, 28, P. L. 34, 210.

early church fathers, both in sermons and epistles. Jerome, one of the great fathers in the West, wrote in praise of the perpetual virginity of Mary, the mother of Jesus. However, even in spite of the reintroduction of the cult of the Mother Goddess in the form of the cult of the Virgin Mary, woman is subordinated definitely to the masculine principle. Had not Mary kneeled at the feet of her Son, saying, "I am the servant of the Lord"? Mary, Mother Goddess, Queen of Angels, Magna Mater, freely and meekly accepts her inferiority.

What a lift to the male ego, says Simone De Beauvoir. "This is the supreme masculine victory, consummated in the cult of the Virgin—it is the rehabilitation of the woman through the accomplishment of her defeat." God alone is Lord and King; woman as *servant* is entitled to deification. The Virgin Mary is "the inverse aspect of Eve the sinner; she crushes the serpent underfoot; she is the mediatrix of salvation, as Eve was of damnation." The Virgin is transfigured, but she is also enslaved.¹

In passing it should be noted that virginity as conceived in the Christian tradition which subordinated the woman through deifying her, means something different from virginity in the earlier traditions. Virginity originally meant openness to all men, possessed by none. Temple virgins were sacred because they were not owned by any one male devotee. Virginity in Christian theology came to stand for the exact opposite: that which had never been touched by any male! Thus even virginity had only a negative value. Woman as queen of the mystery of birth was effectively demoted.

Feminine Subordination Illustrated in Reinterpretation of Maternal Waters

We have earlier commented on the centrality of the maternal waters, the womb of the universe, in all early myths. In the Christian liturgical recasting of the myth, the waters are still regarded as maternal, indeed a womb, but now it is Christ the Son who creates the new maternity of the waters.² The Christian ritual also reflects something of the theme of the Dragon fight; here Christ the Hero must return to the womb before he can be resurrected to the higher life. Cyril of Jerusalem describes Christ descending into the water where the dragons exist, in order to break their heads. Describing Christian baptism, he wrote also, "In coming forth you have found yourself in the brightness of day. At the same time you died and were born, and this wholesome water has become for you both a

¹ Simone De Beauvoir, *op. cit.*, pp. 171-172.

² Cf. Beirnaert, "Mythic Dimension in Christian Sacramentalism," *Cross Currents*, Vol. 2, Fall, 1951, p. 76.

tomb and a mother."¹ In the Christian ritual, Christ is not regenerated by the waters, the waters of death and of the womb, but he is victorious over them. Christ, the masculine principle, creates a new femininity, a new womb, the Catholic Church. Bishop Cyprian wrote, "For the second birth which occurs in baptism begets children of God; but if the bride of Christ is one, which is the Catholic Church, it is she that alone begets sons of God" (Epistle 74). For Leo the Great the baptismal womb is paralleled with the womb of the Virgin, which symbolizes the Church, but it is Christ, the masculine principle, who gives the power to the Virgin-Church.

"For every man who is born again, the water of baptism is as a virginal womb; the same Spirit which made fruitful the Virgin also makes fruitful the font.

"The origin which Christ took from the maternal womb of the Virgin He places in the font of the baptismal vessel. He gives to the water what He gave to his Mother."

(Sermon 24)

Methodius of Philippi describes it thus:

"In each baptism Christ comes down again; He 'recapitulates' His Passion and the sleep of death; and during this recapitulation . . . the Church, the Second Eve, is taken from His side. In the same act, one bone and flesh that they are, they consummate their nuptials, we are conceived and born, the church is made *Mother Church*."²

The above citations would indicate that the feminine archetype in Roman Catholicism is rather complex. Images of daughter, wife and mother overlap; but the masculine principle, the Spirit, is always in the ascendancy.³

The Unbalanced Predicament

In the Occidental world generally the feminine side of the psyche remained subordinated to the masculine side. However, the victory of the males was really no victory. Woman as *the Other* remained a continuing threat. The masculine side of the psyche desires woman as servant: the

¹ Catecheses Mystagogicae, II 4. P. G. 33, 1080. Cited in Beirnaert.

² Joseph C. Plumpe, *Mater Ecclesia*, Washington, p. 133. Cited in Beirnaert, *op. cit.*

³ Cf. Beirnaert, *op. cit.*, p. 83: The femininity is *daughter* of God in that it rises "in its virginal mystery only before Him." It is the *spouse* of God "for it is to it that God unites Himself." It is the *mother* of God "for it gives Him rebirth in the world and in souls."

unconscious must be subordinated to the conscious. The feminine side of the psyche wants woman as companion. This polarity which, when aggravated, leads to real personality splits, is felt both by men and women, though in differing degrees. The more sensitive men and women dream the dream of a reconciliation or a true communion.

Unfortunately for everyone concerned, after the patriarchy gained the ascendancy in religion and life, women submitted to the changed situation and tended to dream the dream of the males. The gods worshipped by the men, reflecting their own arrested development and inner confusion, became largely the gods whom the women worshipped. Women acquiesced in their enforced inferiority. As a result, woman found it increasingly hard to experience herself as *subject*. She remained essentially an *object*, a piece of property to be sought after by the competing males. Being prone to revel in a kind of exhibitionistic way in her sexuality, the female inevitably confirmed the males in their treatment of her as an object of lust primarily. That women learned to exploit this situation, for reasons probably not clear even to herself, was a part of her adjustment to what a male-dominated society had made of her. Unable to experience herself truly as subject, she created no myth of her own in which her dreams were reflected. She tended to become increasingly what men were prone to make of her.

The entire revolt against femininity, a necessary step in the development of masculine consciousness of heroic stature, went too far and jeopardized larger human values. The history of this revolt is written large in the history of Western cultures and religions in the past 2,500 years, culminating in the cruel orthodoxies of the Stalinist state and over-heated nationalisms where obedience to the man or men calling the signals is the mark of supreme patriotism, and willingness to sign non-disloyalty oaths is the highest virtue.

Out of an obsession with power, mankind has come close to severing its tie with nature. For the equality of all children in the eyes of Mother Nature—wherein all persons live to face the same human perplexities and die to face the same Unknown, without reference to creed, sex or skin pigmentation—patriarchially-oriented man has substituted the brotherhood of those who belong to the same class, set or caste. Man's sense of rootedness in the great life stream has been weakened seriously.

What does it mean, that "the countries in Europe which are among the most democratic, peaceful and prosperous ones, and the United States, the most prosperous country in the world, show the most severe symptoms of mental disturbance"? The countries for which figures are

available, which have both the highest suicide rate and also the highest alcoholism rate are the United States, Switzerland, Sweden and Denmark.¹ These are not figures we can gloss over lightly. Modern western civilization is apparently failing to satisfy some of the profounder needs of man. Modern man is apparently more neurotic than heroic.

¹ Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society*, Rinehart, N. Y., 1955, pp. 8-10.

IV TOWARD RECONCILIATION

The Feminine Hero

Up to this point we have concentrated on the masculine side of development, noting what happened both to man's religions and his attitude toward women. If the masculine pilgrimage, or the journey of the male consciousness, centers around the struggle of the ego and its need to identify with the heavenly Father, the principle of light and consciousness; the feminine mystery centers around birth and rebirth. This we shall illustrate briefly from the tale of Eros and Psyche, from the *Metamorphoses* or *Golden Ass* of Lucius Apuleius.¹

In the tale, Psyche is the feminine character, Eros the masculine one. The initial problem for feminine consciousness is the same as for the masculine consciousness. Psyche must break away from the tight clutches of the Mother Goddess, in this story pictured as the jealous Aphrodite. Eros is the son of Aphrodite and Zeus and his mother commissions him to bring about the downfall of Psyche through causing her to fall in love with the vilest of men.

Psyche's task, of breaking away from the Mother Goddess, is not to be accomplished as with the masculine Hero, through identification with the heavenly Father. For this would be to deny something deep in her womanly nature. Her task is to learn how to love so that the mystery of a higher birth may be performed through her and in her. She cannot learn how to love until she has confronted the hostile, indeed "vile," side of the male. Her experience of the hostile side of the male is in the nature of a rape by a beast. Seen from the matriarchal point of view, every marriage is a rape of Kore, the virginal bloom, by Hades, the ravishing earthly aspect of the hostile male.² What for the masculine Hero is experienced as a

¹ For the tale and commentary from a Jungian point of view see Eric Neumann, *Amor and Psyche: The Psychic Development of the Feminine*, Pantheon, N. Y., 1956. Echoes of this basic theme are found in such fairy tales as Beauty and the Beast; Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, etc. In the above volume, the commentary uses only the Greek names for the deities, whereas the tale itself uses Roman titles.

² Cf. Neumann, *Amor and Psyche*, pp. 62-3: "The character of rape that the event assumes for womanhood expresses the projection—typical of the matriarchal phase—of the hostile element upon the man. . . . The fundamental situation of the feminine . . . is the primordial relation of identity between daughter and mother. For this reason the approach of the male always and in every case means separation. Marriage is always a mystery, but also a mystery of death."

taking possession of, and for the immature male even a victory, is experienced by the immature woman as a rape, and by the mature woman (who is no longer projecting her own hostility onto the male) as destiny, transformation and the deepest mystery of life—namely, the entering into genuine life.

In the tale, Psyche is to be exposed on a high crag, in all the pomp of funeral robes, to wait for a bridegroom "fierce and wild and of the dragon breed." Psyche waits with fear and trembling on the crag, only to be carried gently by "a soft air from the breathing West" to "a flowery sward in the bosom of a deep vale." Awakening from her sleep, she enters a beautiful palace and at nightfall, trembling for her honor and shaking out of terror, receives her unknown husband who makes Psyche his bride and departs before dawn.

Psyche falls deeply in love with her invisible husband, who is the god Eros. But soon she begins to lament her captivity within the walls of her luxurious prison, deprived of human conversation. Desiring to see her sisters, she persuades her husband to bring this about, though he warns her that the craving of her heart will bring only harm. The elder sisters, come to visit her, are greatly impressed with the splendor of her palace and curious about her husband. They go away very envious, desiring to bring about Psyche's downfall. They then tell Psyche that her husband is a huge serpent with a thousand tangled coils, with blood and deadly poison dripping from his throat and from the cavernous horror of his gaping jaw. They then counsel Psyche to kill the beast by severing his head from his body, in the light of an oil lamp.

What is meant by this chapter of the tale?

One stratum of the feminine consciousness involves an intense dislike of the masculine component, expressed specifically as hatred of the male because of his beastliness. The elder sisters in the tale are the projection of Psyche's own ambivalence. Psyche has been very much in love with her invisible husband, but she has loved him *in the dark only*. Her husband has never allowed her to look upon him. She feels herself to be in a kind of prison. She finds herself loving the husband and hating the beast in the same body and at the same time. Fascinated by the lover whom she knows in part, she senses a strong desire to kill the husband who will not show his face.

It is possible that her hostility springs in part out of fear that she will be engulfed or swamped by her attachment to the masculine principle, Eros. Psychologically speaking, so long as she loves only instinctively and without the light of her own higher feminine consciousness (i. e., so long as

she loves only "in the dark"), this is true. The serpent which is urging her to look upon her husband and slay him, is thus pushing her in the direction of the birth of that higher feminine consciousness. This need to know, to become aware of love in its heights as well as in its depths, is a part of the feminine psyche. Without awareness, even though it involves mutilation and (temporary) separation, there is no true growth toward fulfilment.

Thus Psyche, in the tale by Apuleius, approaches the bed upon which the invisible Eros lies, prepared to kill the beast, the masculine principle that would engulf her and drown her higher femininity. However, the lantern reveals not a beast but a god. Psyche marvels at the sight, falls to her knees and tries to hide the blade in her own heart, but the knife slips from her hands. Marvelling at this new vision of love, she takes one of the arrows from the quiver of Eros, but her hand trembles and she pricks herself. So all unwitting, yet of her own doing, Psyche falls in love with a depth of passion she had not experienced before. Oil from the burning lamp falls upon the sleeping Eros. Awakened by the burning smart, Eros sees that his secret has been betrayed. He tears himself from the embraces of his unhappy bride and flies away. Turning to her, he says in accents of woe, "Ah, Psyche, I wounded myself with my own shafts of love . . . that you should think me a wild beast and try to kill me . . . I who love you so dearly. . . . I will punish you thus, by flying from you."

What light does this throw upon the psychology of the feminine? Does it not stand for that moment in the life of the woman when, emerging from the darkness of her own unconscious, from her subservience to the Mother Goddess, she comes into active encounter with the authentically masculine and discovers as a woman that *she loves*? She sees that the distinction between beast and lover is not valid. She is no longer a *victim* of love, loving in the dark instinctively, but an actively loving woman. She has become one-in-herself.¹

Psyche also experiences the hurt of love, wounding herself on the arrow tip. The hurt is compounded by the fact that Psyche now confronts Eros for the first time as an equal. With the confrontation comes separateness. Her heroic act of daring to look has brought suffering, guilt and loneliness into the world.² In the lines of a modern poet,

¹ Cf. Esther Harding, *Woman's Mysteries*, Pantheon, N. Y., 1955, p. 187: "Through such an experience the woman comes into possession of her own masculine soul, which is then no longer projected entirely outside herself into a man who has for her the value of a god, with godlike authority. Thus she becomes complete, whole."

² Thus her act is analogous to the Hero's separation of the World Parents which also brought guilt and pain. In each case a journey or pilgrimage is called for, involving trials.

Earth comes into love—
and something like heaven
and what would be hell
if it were not for earth and heaven.¹

What about Eros?

He had not planned for Psyche to love him except in the darkness of her own unconscious. Her act of seeing him, even though it ends later in her loving him more fully, means for him both wounding and separation. Psyche's willingness to take the chance of losing him, inevitably wounds the masculine ego. Eros has wanted to be simply the heroically-possessing lover. He had not asked to be confronted as an equal. So the first result of Psyche's deed is his own hurt and a necessity to flee.

Psyche's growth from this point forward takes the form of trying to transcend, through suffering and struggle, the separation brought about by her action. And for her own growth to proceed properly, there must be a parallel growth in the masculine consciousness, in Eros.² Both male and female must undertake the steep climb up the path of reconciliation if their own supreme identity is to be realized. Each must sacrifice something of the little self if the larger self is to emerge.

We need not go into the various deeds which Psyche has to perform before she is reunited with Eros. She rewins Eros not by any attack in force but by being essentially feminine. She performs her labors (in the tale of Apuleius) with the help of the masculine consciousness, but remains true to her womanhood. Like the masculine hero, she too must make a journey to the underworld, to look death in the face. In essence, this journey is the invitation to regress to the frigidity of maidenhood. Her opening of the box of beauty ointment, contrary to the most specific warnings and instructions, leads her into a death-like sleep, so that she apparently has failed. But her failure is really her victory, for it is the very thing which leads her to reunion with Eros. What she sacrifices through this act is her masculine side, which had led to the original separation; she chooses beauty rather than knowledge, and thus proves the priority of the feminine in herself. She does not seek beauty in order to have power over others, as the immature woman does. She seeks beauty for the sake of the beloved, and it is this act which "frees" Eros who has been made prisoner by his wounding. Thus her sacrifice, or second death, is but a prelude to the redemption of both herself and Eros.

¹ Jeanne D'Orge, Cycle: "Red Seed," from *Voice in the Circle* (Noel Young, Santa Barbara, 1955, p. 61.).

² Cf. Neumann, *Amor and Psyche*, p. 83.

The tale of Apuleius ends with a great marriage banquet in heaven. The daughter who is subsequently born to them is called Joy. The fulfilment of the tasks laid upon human consciousness is a state of joy that lies beyond the opposites of pleasure and pain.

Invitation to a Pilgrimage

The evolution of man's consciousness must continue. The terrific technical power of the human hand which can launch rockets toward the moon and Mars and release the power of the atoms, has outreached the power of the spirit to discipline and to control such might. There is unfinished business for the truly heroic consciousness. Mankind stands accused of arrested development. To try to go back to the imagined simplicities of the past is impossible. To try to stand still in the midst of present perplexities, racisms, and nationalisms is to court disaster. To try to cross new frontiers of the mind and spirit seems to be the only truly live option.

To break the tie with Nature, the Mother Goddess of the myths, only to end up exploiting her ruthlessly because of over-identification with a Father who incorporates only qualities of sovereignty, power and authority, is to prove that man remains in the bondage of delayed adolescence. If it is correct to say that worship of the Mother Goddess reflects the drive for security, the worship of unmitigated masculinity in the guise of stern Father Gods reflects the drive for power. Such gods are not worthy of worship; they are idols, products of confused psyches, inventions of immature religious consciousness. The gods men cling to are the product of their own fevered needs. Whatever is Most Real holds us; we do not need to cling to "it." *cat & Monkey lololo.*

The Break with Idolatrous Father Gods

Since over-identification with gods conceived in the image of the masculine consciousness is pre-eminently the problem of the three Semitic religions, this is a problem of peculiar intensity for European-American tradition. Marxist Communism with its brittle intolerances, its chosen-people complex, its Messianic dream, its crusading fervor, is a living and terrifying part of that Semitic tradition. Unfortunately the major religious traditions of Asia are largely moribund at that very point in modern history when Western man needs most desperately to feel the force of their genius. The transformation or dilation of consciousness in Western man cannot await the anticipated renaissance of Buddhism, much as that renaissance will be welcomed.

The break with the idolatries of patriarchal religions could conceivably happen more quickly than the break with a purely matriarchal type of religion took place. The world of the patriarchies, of the Father Gods, is more historically conditioned than the world of the matriarchies, of the Mother Goddess. For the world of the fathers is the world of law codes, of order, or reason and logic. But the world of the instinctive tendencies, of the unconscious, varies not at all from place to place. It is the very relativity of the taboos of patriarchal societies, the very particularity of the codes of Hammurabi, Manu and Moses, that makes it more possible to attack them. It is a real step toward maturity when the Torah, the Ten Commandments, or any law code can be seen to be earthborn, the product of human societal needs. At this point biblical criticism has made a more mature contribution to the undermining of immature attitudes toward religion and Bibles generally than the over-heated, intemperate charges of the Communist societies for the propagation of atheism.

Patriarchal religions inevitably tend to be strictly authoritarian. "Thou shalt obey" is both the first and the last commandment in a patriarchy. "Believe and obey" is the formula one large church has always stressed. "Keep the Torah to the last jot and tittle." When Prometheus steals the fire, even though it is for the benefit of mankind, he must be punished. When the Quakers in Boston Bay Colony suggested the possibility of worshipping God in a different way, the authoritarian Puritan conscience dealt with them harshly. He who disagrees is a heretic and must be liquidated. This is true of twentieth-century Communism as fully as it is true of Spanish Catholicism, or thirteenth-century Christendom.¹

Over-identification with the heavenly Father can also lead to *hubris*—the sin of over-reaching oneself, in Christian terms the sin of pride. The fate of such an individual is reflected in the story of Icarus who flies too near the sun, and of Bellerophon who tries to reach heaven on a winged horse, Pegasus.

¹ The Hero must identify with the Father in order to fight the dragon form of the Mother Goddess successfully. But having shaken himself free of the lure to regress to infancy, he must overcome the Father in his terrible aspect. The Midrash interprets Genesis 12.1, where Abraham is told to leave his father's house and country, as meaning that Abraham must destroy the gods of his father. Ever since, in the Western world, this biblical story has stood as an epitomization of man's pilgrimage of faith.

That obedience is the highest good is also reflected in the account of Mount Sinai being roped off, since Yahweh had descended upon it in fire and smoke. Whoever is not with Moses in his desert trials must die. The terrible father always demands willingness to sacrifice—whether of an only son, Isaac, or of a Jesus. This is the central theme of the patriarchal system.

Living itself demands sacrifice, not necessarily in the literal sense of "making holy" but in the sense of giving up something in order to achieve or realize something else. However, the sacrifices demanded by patriarchal religions tend to be just as irrational and cruel as those resorted to in the matriarchal religions concerned with the fertility processes in nature. Human victims go on being offered to deity, or animal substitutes as in Judaism and Islam. In Christianity it is still a human victim that is sacrificed, though symbolically rather than literally. The priest performing the sacrifice is identified with the victim as in many earlier forms of religion. The Christian ritual of the Mass reflects this, for Christ is both Victim and Priest. "Himself the Victim and Himself the Priest" is a verse of a hymn based on Hebrews 7: 27. The Christian affirmation that "there is no salvation without the shedding of blood" is the expression of a much more archaic level in human experience. The "Mystery" of the Mass, of the sacrifice, is not to be questioned by the orthodox Christian any more than the finality of the Torah is to be questioned by the Orthodox Jew. In each tradition, authoritarianism carries the day and the devotee; one is not allowed to raise any questions about first assumptions.¹

It thus is apparent that the growth of consciousness must not stop at

¹ In the male-oriented language of depth psychology, this is known as "castration"; one sacrifices that which makes growth in further awareness possible. In earlier times such castration was literal in many cases. Such castration may be practiced out of fear of the Mother Goddess, as in the mysteries of ancient Thrace. In later times the castration is symbolic, evidenced in the total renunciation of the opposite sex, the adoption of feminine attire on the part of the males, and in a docile subservience to the ecclesiastical authorities. When it is done out of fear of the heavenly Father, it may take the form of a world-negating mysticism, strict ascetic practices but without overt mutilation, and a meticulous concern with observing the Law combined with fear and trembling before God the Other. For that type of rigid Puritan who seeks to impose his conscience as the other person's guide, the great concern with both ceremonial and moral "rightness" is a reflection of this inability to move on heroically.

There is an interesting Gnostic version of the Garden of Eden myth. In this version Adam is a true hero when he breaks the command laid upon him by the terrible creator-god Yahweh, and eats of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. For he thus was in a position to impart the new knowledge to mankind. The principle expressed here would seem to be: Blessed is he who disobeys *if he knows what he is doing*.

Identifying with the Father does not necessarily mean the end of all tendencies to revert to the Mother Goddess. "The Promised Land," which Abraham had set out to reach, became in later generations the center of a new regression, a new idolatry, "a land flowing with milk and honey." Land, milk and honey are all feminine symbols. The subsequent Jewish hope for a Messianic time which would be tied to the soil of Palestine became for many a new fixation, and still remains that for orthodoxy. Added to the Mother motif was the patriarchal concept of "special chosenness" and the favored son. Fromm points out that for the non-orthodox Jew "the concept of the Messianic time is that of the complete victory over the incestuous ties, and the full establishment of the spiritual reality of moral and intellectual conscience, not only among the Jews, but among all peoples of the earth" (*The Sane Society*, p. 53).

the point when belief in the heavenly Father becomes strong. The pilgrimage must go on. If some of the Oriental religions—the “peoples without histories”—have over-stressed the Mother Goddess motif, staying close in symbols and rituals to fertility cult concepts and being psychologically bound to the traditional past; the Western religions seem to have worshipped at the shrine of an exaggerated masculinity in religion. Oriental man sought nutrition and security, and instead found malnutrition, poverty and stagnation. Occidental man sought power, order and reason, in its place he found terror, aggravated competitiveness, and loss of touch with the deeper resources of nature in himself.

Toward the Reconciliation of Diverse Emphases

Man must press on, both in East and West, to seek pathways of reconciliation. He who has “know-how” but little “know-why” is on the path to complete mental breakdown. Man will not remain content indefinitely with huddling in fox-holes or bomb shelters, or lying on psycho-analytic couches. The shibboleths of nationalism are wearing thin for people in various parts of the globe. Man was made with a capacity for relatedness that cannot be stopped at the water’s edge or by color of skin pigmentation.

To find more meaningful relatedness man is called to a journey that is both inward and outward at the same time. Over-concentration on the development of an inner life can lead to egocentric introspection, withdrawal from the responsibilities of meeting the outer world, or an equating of outer non-action with spiritual tranquility. On the other hand, a too exclusive concern with mastery of the outer environment hands one over to forces he cannot control, creates a partial person who seeks to dominate others and who revels in power-manipulation. As Baynes has said, “The solution cannot be found either in deriding Eastern spirituality as impotent, or by mistrusting science as a destroyer of humanity. We have to see that the spirit must lean on science as its guide in the world of reality, and that science must turn to the spirit for the meaning of life.”¹

Nietzsche wrote long ago, “Dead are all the gods.”

This is an important truth, but it is only part of the story. Man’s gods should always be dying, for the gods men believe in are the projected forces of his own unconscious. But the processes deep in man himself which have always produced the gods still go on. The god-making process continues. No man can live without projections any more than he can live

¹ Cary F. Baynes, in *Secret of the Golden Flower*, by Wilhelm & Jung, p. viii.

without breathing. There are, roughly, two kinds of projections. A distinction between them is valid if one recognizes that the two shade into each other in a person's life.

The first might be called *compensatory* projections. They grow out of emotional blockages within and they consist of distorted images of other persons and their motives. For these compensatory images have little or no correspondence to the situation "as it is out there"; they do speak eloquently of the unlearned lessons, or the gaps in one's own emotional maturity "here inside." Such projections usually carry a high emotional charge.¹

There are also what might more appropriately be called *exploratory* projections. These do not grow primarily out of inner emotional blockages or the projecting of distorting images or motivations, as they grow out of lack of knowledge regarding the world, both inner and outer. Such projections undoubtedly carry some emotional charge since they reflect the organism's need for wholeness or unity; but they serve a primarily *cognitive* function. They provide a comforting quasi-knowledge about things not truly understood. When the scientists began "discovering" astronomical laws, the process of despiritualizing the world (what Jung refers to as the withdrawal of projections) had begun. From that time down to the emergence of modern positivism, the process of "withdrawing the gods or spirits" from mountains, trees, rivers, sticks, stones and even man has continued.

In modern language, exploratory projections are known as concepts, hypotheses, theories, laws. They are always entertained tentatively and are tested against all available known facts. In this they differ from compensatory projections which are always held tenaciously. If there are scientists who hold their hypotheses, laws and concepts tenaciously—and of course many in every generation have—this simply illustrates the principle that compensatory projections operate in all of us and are the hardest to withdraw or outgrow.

Both types of projections serve a psychotherapeutic function. In the former case, compensatory projections, they serve as aspirin until one is inwardly ready to see the world of persons as it is, not as he imagines it to be. The belief in Satan has undoubtedly helped many people get along

¹ Cf. Jung, *Psychology & Religion*, Yale Press, New Haven, 1938, pp. 101-102: "Our ordinary psychological life is still swarming with projections. All gaps in actual knowledge are still filled with projections. We are still almost certain we know what other people think or what their true character is. We are convinced that certain people have the bad qualities we do not know in ourselves. . . . We are still swamped with projected illusions."

with their own guilty sense of being evil or bad. Primitive people projected freely in this regard; so does every primitive-minded modern.

The positive function of exploratory projections is in their providing a point on which to stand while one seeks through further research, or experience, to enlarge his frame of reference. Every projection, then, should be temporary. In some sense all of us are "on the way" to maturity. Some of us are just more "wayward" than others. Projections can be pedagogues to enlightenment. The pedagogue, in the ancient classical world, was the slave who escorted the student to the threshold of the school; the student entered the school by himself. Projections are necessary tools fabricated by the human psyche in its search for larger knowledge and understanding.

All the religions of mankind have offered man projective systems. But when people are encouraged to believe in their own beliefs, cling to their creeds, dogmas, traditional postures simply because they are traditional, they are being asked to negate the on-going life process and the search for whole-natured responses. Man does not live by projections, ideas, concepts. These may constitute the bread of our ordinary lives. Many an institution that started out by offering bread ends up handing out only crusts and then stones. Man is made for growth in a direction that is apparently determined, at its deepest, by the structure of the human psyche and the human spirit about which we still know only an infinitesimal amount. Man seeks wholeness, reintegration as the struggling seed seeks the air and the sunlight.

The things that men create, including his concepts, creeds, and theories, became prison houses, restricting the spirit. Esther Harding has well observed that "we forget that it is not in our creations, the things we make, the order we establish, but *in our functioning* that life is fulfilled in us."¹ The aim of all education should be to help us find release and wholeness and the capacity for lovingness through our creating.

This involves *ascesis*—training.

Unfortunately this Greek word, translated as asceticism in the West, became associated in practice with the Manichaeian idea of the badness of the human body and the evil of fleshly desires. A great deal of monasti-

¹ Esther Harding, *Woman's Mysteries*, p. 213: "The important thing as far as we personally are concerned is that we should create something which did not exist before, not in order that some new good thing should exist in the world, but that, by taking the raw material of life, which lies all about us, and by breathing our life into it and making of it a living creation, we should unfold the latent power of creator which slumbers within us, for this is our most godlike faculty."

cism, Christian, Hindu, and Buddhist, has been pathological in origin, involving the acceptance of this false dualism of body versus spirit.

But without *ascesis*, training, there can be no true art. Without tremendous patience in keyboard practice, the pianist cannot be a channel of creativity. Without preparation, engaged in with love, there is no fulfillment. Hence the fatal inadequacy of the philosophy of "on the road" of Jack Kerouac and his "Dharma bums." One cannot safely abandon himself to the Now unless he has worked through some of the primary developmental tasks posed for every human being. Abandonment is worse than a sop if one is only abandoning himself to the anarchism of conflicting wants, drives, claims, compensations. If one seeks to love out of anger or emptiness, there is no true loving but only a mockery. Such a one loves without joy, drinks wine without flavor, and sings his song without gladness.

The god-making process continues. The God man believes in has no status in the form in which he is believed in: here the religious mystic and the atheist agree. But there is always "the God beyond god" which the thoughtful person cannot ignore: the need to search, the need to need, the need to grow, to create may be the only sign of Its presence which we can talk about. The negative pole of our life—the world of material forms, of atoms and machines, of bombs and beasts, of pain and travail—is always very much in evidence. But the operation of the positive pole—the life of art, the life of the spirit—can be sensed only through its by-products, its interaction within us. It cannot be laid hold of directly.

Hence the myth-making process continues. The unconscious depths in man ever seeks to express something of itself in new hypotheses, generative concepts, a new "myth." The concept of the Self would seem to be just such an upthrust from the unconscious. This is a generative symbol which is taking on rich connotations in the work of people dealing with problems of child growth, personality development, mental illness, and the search for insight or wisdom in living. This Real Self is to be distinguished from the ego or the sham selves which each man is prone to identify himself with.

This concept of a Real Self, distinguishable from partial images of a self, is not an invention of depth psychology. It is reflected in the common speech of ordinary people; e.g., "I am not myself today," "I am beside myself," etc. Skilled counselors and psychiatrists have helped many to come to a deeper knowledge of their Selfhood, and this in spite of the fact that there is no scientific demonstration that such a Self "exists." It

is a fruitful postulate demanded by human experience. It is related to the search for maturity.

The concern for integration, for maturity, for being "a real person," is a modern expression of the age-old search for salvation. In these modern concepts and symbols which point beyond the empirical data, we see the spirit of man still trying to articulate through rituals and myths something of its concern for meaning and purpose.

A biologist writes, "A single whole organism is the goal toward which development proceeds. This wholeness is immanent in all of its parts." Examination of the facts concerning the cell suggests that "there is present in a living organism, and most conspicuously in man, a central integrating factor, the sum of its regulatory activities, and specifically different in each individual, which deserves the name of *self*."¹

Around the explorations into the nature of selfhood, new hypotheses will be engendered. Also new rituals will appear. What form these rituals, or prescribed ways of searching into the many facets of the psyche, will take we dare not try to predict. The ritual of the psychoanalytic couch, butt of many jokes, has nonetheless proved of real value to many people. Techniques, both of exploration and of therapy, will be refined, we can trust. The disciplines and rituals of painting, of music, of ceramics, of the arts generally, as well as the rituals involved in pure research, will play their parts in varying degrees with different persons.

Such rituals must not negate either the life of the instincts or the life of the mind. "If the physical and the psychical are a unity, why should we despise the one and honor only the other? Both come from life, so should not both be served?"² Each is a colleague of the other. Lines of communication between the conscious and the unconscious must be allowed to open up. Evidence from past experience would indicate that whole-natured involvement in artistic endeavor is of more instrumental value here than engaging too much in conceptualizing or "ideal-izing." The arts may become channels of inner reunion. Creation is also recreation when spirit and body work together instead of pulling against each other.

The relationship of man with woman is a continuing laboratory where one can possibly come to his larger selfhood. The history of the past few

¹ Sinnott, *Matter, Mind and Man*, p. 108.

² Sinnott, *op. cit.*, p. 79. Cf. C. G. Jung, "The Spirit of Psychology," in *Spirit and Nature*, Pantheon, N. Y., 1954, p. 429: "The ego keeps its integrity only if it does not identify with one of the opposites (collective consciousness and collective unconsciousness), and if it understands how to hold the balance between them. This is only possible if it remains conscious of both at once."

thousand years of marriage, both in matriarchal and patriarchal societies, cannot make one feel too happy. Men and women have managed to go on hurting each other needlessly, standing in the way of their own deeper growth, more often than any divorce court statistics or Gallup Poll could reveal. The effects of distorting traditions and religions should not be minimized, but no advantage comes from trying to locate blame. What is called for is experimentation in learning how to overcome the inner and outer obstacles to mature loving.

Erich Fromm has summed up part of the wisdom involved in the art of loving. "Love is possible only if two persons communicate with each other from the center of their existence, hence if each one of them experiences himself from the center of his existence. Only in this 'central experience' is human reality, only here is aliveness, only here is the basis for love. Love, experienced thus, is a constant challenge; it is not a resting place, but a moving, growing, working together; even whether there is harmony or conflict, joy or sadness, is secondary to the fundamental fact that two people experience themselves from the essence of their existence, that they are one with each other by being one with themselves, rather than by fleeing from themselves. There is only one proof for the presence of love: the depth of the relationship, and the aliveness and strength in each person concerned; this is the fruit by which love is recognized."¹

Modern psychology seems to be writing another footnote to an old insight—that in order to find the real self, one must learn how to give the old selves away. The myth of the Dragon and the Dragon Slayer is still being played in our midst. Life and death are inseparable in the psyche as in the body. Cancer seems to be related to a riot of cells, cells that insist on unregulated, uncontrolled division. When the normal sequence of cell death stops, the result for the organism is a horrible distortion—cancer. Every moment of life for the body of the animal depends upon the certain death of cells in its tissues. This would suggest, by way of analogy only of course, that to live well, one must learn to die well—continuously. We can hope that more research in the biological and psychological fields will throw more light on this analogy.

For the man who has given up the "mode" or "style" of the age, the archaic myths are dead or dying. The old myths no longer have evocative or regulative power—the myth of the eternally revolving wheel of *karma*, the gods of Olympus, Fuji or Sinai, the Mother Goddess and the Father God, these are all reflections of the childhood years now gone. The myth

¹ Erich Fromm, *The Art of Loving*, Harper, N. Y., 1956, p. 103.

of the Kingdom of God on earth, of the returning Messiah, of "Progress," of "a world made safe for democracy," of a classless society—these are now seen as partial expressions of man's need to accept the challenge of continuing to grow, living by *hope* rather than by hopes, living by *faith* rather than by a faith.

Post-modern man has come out of those dim woods wherein the tribal gods were felt to reside. The woods have betrayed us. Now we must learn to steer by the stars overhead. The crucial question is, shall we walk on in fear or in faith? A modern poet has described very well the mood of the fearful.

We come out of the forest, fearing stars,
bowed by going forever under branches.
How lost, how low are laid our girdling trees!

It was safe in those dim woods,
our bodies were shaped to the forest, heavy and shy.
The guardians of the tribe, thick wooden lords,
blessed us with painted eyes beneath moss-curls,
water fell broken and kind from the rustling heavens
whose green held rumours of another sky.

We knew that lions prowled the wood's edge, for their eyes
torched terribly the darkness,
their threats flattered us where we huddled
warm and unseen among the totem leaves.

Now in a tempest-year the wood betrays us,
our leafy castles are thrown, the bark-gods dead
and we go walking warily in this bare landscape
fearing stars.

Still bowed by going forever under branches
our spines rebel at the vertical:
to be proud in the tall wind is to be naked
to lions' eyes.

How lost, how low are laid our girdling trees.¹

Spiritual maturity involves learning how to walk out of the dim woods wherein the guardians of the tribe blessed us, pampered us and confused us, without either reaching for the stars or fearing them. To reach for the stars is to repeat the sin of Icarus, the sin of hubris, the pride of Hit-

¹ Leah Bodine Drake, *This Liling Dust*.

ler, the pride of the wielders of the bomb. That way lies disaster. To be afraid of the stars is simply to pave the way for new tribal exploiters who will manipulate us for their partial goals.

There is an ancient Oriental saying, "To search after God is to be like the man who walks in circles trying to see his own eyes. Those who understand this walk straight on." May we be among those who learn what it means to *walk on*.

* * *

BOOKS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE PRECEDING LECTURES

- Cassirer, Ernst *Language and Myth* (Harper, N. Y., 1946)
- Cassirer, Ernst *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (3 vols., Yale Press, New Haven, 1953-)
- Coomaraswamy, A. K. *The Darker Side of Dawn* (Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, Vol. 94, No. 1)
- De Beauvoir, Simone *The Second Sex* (Knopf, N. Y., 1953)
- Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Beacon, Boston, 1957)
- Eliade, Mircea *Birth and Rebirth* (Harper, N. Y., 1958)
- Eliade, Mircea *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1954)
- Fromm, Erich *The Forgotten Language* (Rinehart, N. Y., 1951)
- Fromm, Erich *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (Yale Press, New Haven, 1950)
- Goodenough, E. R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (8 vols.) (Pantheon, N. Y., 1953-58)
- Harding, Esther *Psychic Energy: Its Source and Goal* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1947)
- Harding, Esther *Woman's Mysteries, Ancient and Modern* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1955)
- Jung, Carl G. *Symbols of Transformation* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1956)
- Neumann, Erich *Amor and Psyche* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1956)
- Neumann, Erich *The Great Mother* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1955)
- Neumann, Erich *Origins and History of Consciousness* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1954)
- Reik, Theodore *Myth and Guilt* (Braziller, N. Y., 1951)
- Zimmer, Heinrich *The King and the Corpse* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1948)
- Zimmer, Heinrich *Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization* (Pantheon, N. Y., 1946)

5141

Printed at the Industrial School for Crippled Children
241 St. Botolph Street, Boston